MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

Volume XIV
1952

FRANCISCAN MONASTERY
LIBRARY
OLD MISSION, SANTA BARBARA, CAL.

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
TORONTO, CANADA

NIHIL OBSTAT.	*IMPRIMATUR.*
TERENTIUS P. McLAUGHLIN C.S.B. *Cens. Dep.*	✠JACOBUS C. CARDINALIS McGUIGAN *Archiep. Torontin.*

Published Annually by
THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
59 QUEEN'S PARK CRESCENT,
TORONTO 5, CANADA.
SUBSCRIPTION $7.00 A YEAR.
Managing Editor: ALEX. J. DENOMY C.S.B.

PRINTED IN CANADA
BY GARDEN CITY PRESS CO-OPERATIVE, TORONTO

CONTENTS

Richard of Campsall, an English Theologian of the Fourteenth Century .... *Edward A. Synan* 1

Mary Legends in Italian Manuscripts in the Major Libraries of Italy. Groups I-III .. *Sister Mary Vincentine Gripkey* S.C.L. 9

Siger of Brabant's *De Necessitate et Contingentia Causarum* and *Ms* Peterhouse 152 .... *Armand Maurer* C.S.B. 48

The Lateran Missal and Some Allied Documents .... *V. L. Kennedy* C.S.B. 61

St. Augustine's Use of the Word *Character* .... *Nicholas M. Haring* S.A.C. 79

The Irish Counterparts of the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* .... *John Hennig* 98

Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée .... *J. Leclercq* O.S.B. 107

The Meaning of *Est* in the *Sentences* (1152-1160) of Robert of Melun .... *Peter W. Nash* S.J. 129

Mediaevalia:

I. The Round Table and the Council of Rheims, 1049 .... *Alex. J. Denomy* C.S.B. 143

II. *Sub Umbris Arborum* .... *Etienne Gilson* 149

III. Chaucer's Hende Nicholas .... *Paul E. Beichner* C.S.C. 151

IV. A Brief Historical Comment on St. Thomas, *Summa theol.* III, qu. 67, a. 5: *Utrum non baptizatus possit sacramentum baptismi conferre* .... *Nicholas M. Haring* S.A.C. 153

V. Pseudo-Alcuin's *Liber de divinis officiis* and the *Liber 'Dominus vobiscum'* of St. Peter Damiani .... *J. Joseph Ryan* 159

Boethius' *De Consolatione* by Jean de Meun .... *V. L. Dedeck-Héry* 165

COPYRIGHT, 1944, BY
THE PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
59 QUEEN'S PARK CRESCENT, TORONTO

Richard of Campsall, an English Theologian of the Fourteenth Century

EDWARD A. SYNAN

IN the course of examining an anti-Ockhamist *Logica* which, if we are to believe the only known manuscript of the work, is to be attributed to "Campsall the Englishman",[1] the present writer had occasion to bring together what information could be found with respect to this fourteenth century English theologian. The results of this investigation are now presented in the hope that they might serve as a starting point for further research and that our knowledge of this obscure but important figure might thus be extended and, perhaps, corrected.

Professor F. M. Powicke has pointed out that it is probably necessary to distinguish two men named "Richard of Campsall". One was a Fellow of Merton College after a period as Fellow of Balliol and was the author of *Quaestiones* on the *Physics*; for a moment he acted as Commissary for the Chancellor of Oxford (1325/26). The other is identified as the Rector of Saint Martin's at Canterbury in the will of Simon of Bredon, a document drawn up in 1368; Richard of Campsall, Rector of Saint Martin's, acted as executor of this will in 1372.[2] Although Professor Powicke has assigned no reason for the probable distinction between the two "Richards of Campsall", the gap between the dates he mentions has undoubtedly inspired his judgment that not all the sources he adduces can be referred with any probability to the same man. As we shall see presently, the gap is even wider than those documents indicate and unless the Fellow of Balliol and Merton lived to a most improbable old age and was buried at Merton in spite of having left his Fellowship for the Canterbury living, Professor Powicke's warning must be accepted as well-founded. The evidence of our scanty sources presents the picture of a Merton scholar, author of a not unimposing list of works, all of which reflect the normal interests of a fourteenth-century theologian, whereas the Rector of Saint Martin's seems to have left no traces in the academic world apart from having collected books. Some of these the executor of his will sold to Bishop Reed;[3] a volume of seventeen Saints' Lives appears in the catalogue of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury,[4] and two Bibles are found under his name in the catalogue of Dover

---

[1] *Logica Campsale Anglici, valde utilis et realis contra Ocham*, Library of the University of Bologna, n°. 2635, fols. 1^r-99^v; with respect to the attribution to Campsall, cf. also the table of contents, fol. 100^v, where the "compositor" is noted as mentioned on fol. 21^v: De quarto vero est magna difficultas. Illi enim qui ponunt quod genus non est nisi quidem conceptus mentis qui potest univoce et in quid de pluribus praedicari, habent dicere quod non solum res creatae quae non sunt partes illarum rerum ad differentiam materiae et formae quae non sunt in genere nisi per reductionem, non solum, inquam, tales res sunt in genere, sed etiam quod Primum Esse, qui est Deus gloriosus, sit in genere quia unus conceptus potest in quid praedicari de eo et de aliis rebus. Et ego Kamsal, auribus meis, audivi unum doctorem solemnem Oxoniae qui ista determinatione publica dixit: hoc verum esse et quod sine periculo potest dici.

The examination of this anti-Ockhamist work was submitted as a doctoral thesis to the University of Toronto under the title: *The "Logica" Attributed to Richard of Campsall; Study and Texts*, in the spring of 1952. It is with the kind permission of the University authorities that the material of this article has been taken from that thesis.

[2] F. M. Powicke, *The Mediaeval Books of Merton College* (Oxford, 1931), cf. p. 114, *s.v.* "Richard of Camsale or Campsall": for the will of Simon of Bredon, cf. pp. 82-86; it should be noted that the Richard of Campsall who was Rector of Saint Martin's is called *"dominus"* not *"magister"* in this will.

[3] R. T. Gunther, *Early Science in Oxford* II (Oxford Historical Society, Oxford, 1923), p. 59: the author cites *Ms Digby* 176: . . . partem emit de executoribus m. Ricardi Camsale . . . Here the Richard of Campsall is called *"magister"* although as it seems, the Rector of Saint Martin's is meant who is called *"dominus"* in Simon's will; it would appear that outside specifically academic documents, this variation is without great significance.

[4] M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), p. 300, n°. 973: 17 Legenda sanctorum Rici

Priory. The distinction between two men of the same name is, of course, an inference which may yield to new evidence, but with the texts at our disposal. it seems to be secure and it is to the Richard of Campsall who was Fellow of Balliol and Merton that the works written by "Richard of Campsall" must be attributed whereas those possessed by "Richard of Campsall" and found later outside the Merton library must be assigned to the Rector of Saint Martin's.[6] We shall turn, therefore, to the academic career of the Oxford theologian.

I.

Our theologian's name indicates that he was a native of the village of Campsall in the West Riding of Yorkshire. The village still exists, situated about eight miles from Doncaster and notable for the ruins of a mediaeval church which seems to have been enlarged in the early years of the fourteenth century.[7] Its name appears in the Domesday Book as "Cansale" and in view of mediaeval orthography, it will be useful to notice the various spellings of the name. The forms "Camsala" (1157), "Camsal" (1208), "Cameshal" (1227), and "Kameshal" (1239) are given for the village[8] and the modern spelling "Campsall" occurs at least as early as 1680.[9] The theologian himself is designated as "Camsale", "Cameshale", "Campsalis", "Kameshale", "Kampsal", "Cansale", "Kanpsal" and even as "Compsaley" in various manuscript references to his opinions.[10] All these seem to represent normal phonetic variations on "Cansale", the oldest form we know, with an intrusive letter *p* and, owing to the long last syllable, a doubled final letter *l* in the modern spelling.

The earliest dated mention of this Oxford scholar occurs in the records of Merton College; in 1306 he was one of three bursars who rode into Northumberland to take the rents of Ponteland and Embleton Co. and expenses are noted for the shoeing of his horse.[11] He is named among the witnesses to a legal act in the records of Balliol College which the editor's marginal note assigns to a date between 1285 and 1310 as *Dominus Ricardus de Camsale.*[12] Two points make it possible to restrict the period which the editor suggests for the dating of this document. First, in 1308 he is no longer "Dominus" but "Magister" and described as "presently ruling in Arts at Oxford" in a document which records

---

Campsale; for remarks of the editor of the catalogues on the donors of books, cf. p. 539.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 437: remarks on donors, cf. p. 543; the listing in this catalogue is n°. 5:2 Biblia Ricardi cameshale; cf. p. 413, n°. 5, for a second listing of these volumes.

[6] The assignment of books once possessed by Richard of Campsall which are found outside the possession of Merton College to the Campsall of Saint Martin's is motivated by the extreme improbability of a Fellow's books ending outside the collection of the College; *v. infra*, note 29, for the text of Archbishop Kilwardby's statute on the point. It should be noted, however, that even under this statute, a Fellow's books might be lost to the College — they might, for example, be sold to pay his debts.

[7] Cf. J. E. Morris, *The West Riding of Yorkshire* (London, 1931), pp. 145-148; the aisles and nave of the ruins of the mediaeval church, according to this description, seem to have been added in the early fourteenth century which makes the inference of more than one "Richard of Campsall" less difficult to accept.

[8] E. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names* (Oxford, 2nd, ed., 1940), p. 80; also, 'A History of the County of York' in the series *The Victorian History of the Counties of England.* II, p. 246; III, p. 505.

[9] Thus Adams, *Index Villaris* (London, 1680), p. 69.

[10] Cf. the forms in the documents cited in notes 1, 3, 4, 5, 12, 16, 20, and in the *Mss* Vat. *Lat.* 986, fol. 28^v, Gonville and Caius, 668*.

[11] This piece of information has been provided by the librarian of Merton College, Mr. Wallace-Hadrill, who refers to Rec. 5978; the founder of the College had authorized expenses in connection with horses used on College business: cf. *Merton Muniments*, edd. P. S. Allen and H. W. Garrod (OHS, Oxford, 1928), p. 26, ll. 95-96: Yconomi autem aut fratres nullum equum teneant nisi quatenus maneriorum necessitas requirit . . ne Domus ex eorum precio pregravetur . . . nisi tunc demum cum scholares pro communi Domus ipsius utilitate ad loca aliqua fuerint destinati.

[12] H. E. Salter, *The Oxford Deeds of Balliol College* (OHS, Oxford, 1913), p. 141: . . . hiis testibus magistro Thoma de Pontefracto, mago Adam de Kurle, domino Stephano de Curnubia, domino Ricardo de Camsale, domino Galfrido de Tendrynge et aliis. Here the variation between *"magister"* and *"dominus"* must be considered significant of the academic distinction between the Master and the Bachelor; cf. *supra*, note 3.

his fulfilling the office of procurator in company with colleagues from the faculties of Canon and Civil Law in the presence of John Dalderby, Bishop of Lincoln, on the business of the confirmation of William de Bosco as Chancellor of the University.[13] Second, since he appears in the Merton record of 1306 as a bursar of that College and, as we shall see, was later buried in the Merton Chapel,[14] we must assume that from 1306 at least he was a Fellow of Merton for burial among the Fellows is one of the specific advantages guaranteed to members of the College by the founder's statutes.[15] Consequently, his connection with Balliol must pre-date 1306. His Balliol-Merton transfer is confirmed by the record of an act which took place on the 25 July, 1325, in the Hall of Balliol in the presence of several Masters of Theology, Richard of Campsall among them, "who all had once been Fellows of the aforesaid House".[16] The earliest appearance of Campsall's name with the title "Master of Theology" is in a record of the confirmation of Henry de Gower as Chancellor on the 18 October, 1322.[17] On the 14 June, 1323, he is qualified with the title which the English translation of the Worcester *Liber Albus* renders as "professor of sacred scripture",[18] a translation, undoubtedly, of the mediaeval *professor sacrae paginae* which is equivalent to "professor of Theology" since the university organization of our period did not separate, although it did distinguish, the disciplines of Theology and Scripture. In the next year there is a record of fifteen *solidi* annual rent paid by Master Richard of Campsall to Oseney Abbey for a lecture hall.[19]

What seems to have been the high point in our theologian's Oxford career occured in 1325/26 when a town and gown dispute was the occasion of his appointment as commissary to take the place of the Chancellor.[20] The dispute and its solution is a vignette of mediaeval university life and has been preserved in official record by the public notary. The mayor of Oxford, William of Burcester, without the consent of the Chancellor, William of Alburwyke, and indeed against the express prohibition of that "reverend and discreet man", moved the town pillory from its proper and accustomed place to a new location unsanctioned by custom. For this act of contempt, the Chancellor excommunicated the mayor and he in his turn appealed against this sentence in writing to the Regent Masters. Richard of Campsall was assigned to act in the Chancellor's name and the mayor and a train of burghers appeared before him. After an amicable discussion, the mayor agreed to withdraw his appeal to the Regents and to request absolution from our Master of Theology. He was accordingly absolved and conceded both that he had infringed the privileges of the University and that the pillory should be moved again, this time to a place agreed upon by Campsall and himself. All parties went to the pillory and agreed to move it six feet nearer the North Gate (at the end of the modern Corn-market Street)—a judgment of Solomon with which, the notary adds, the mayor and burghers complied within a fortnight.[21]

---

[13] H. E. Salter, *Snappe's Formulary and Other Records* (OHS, Oxford, 1924), p. 66: Memorandum quod viii Idus Aprilis anno domini MCCC octavo apud Tingehurst magistri Ricardus de Cestria in decretis, Willelmus de Ichen in iure civili, ac Ricardus de Camsale in artibus apud Oxoniam actualiter regentes coram episcopo personaliter constituti, exhibuerunt ei literam Universitatis Oxoniae clausam sub hac forma . . . (p. 67) . . . magistrum Ricardum de Camsale officium procuratoris nostre Universitatis . . . faciendum. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 325 for the editor's remarks on this document.

[14] G. C. Brodrick, *Memorials of Merton College with Biographical Notices of the Wardens and Fellows* (OHS, Oxford, 1885), p. 175: Richard Camsale (or Kamshall), S.T.P. He was an eminent theologian, originally of Balliol College. He was Commissary or Vice-Chancellor of the University in 1225 (*sic*). He gave books to the College, and was buried in the Chapel under a marble tablet, inscribed with "Saxon" characters.

[15] *Merton Muniments*, p. 26, ll. 96-97: Socii quoque dicte congregationis, sicuti usque ad vite exterminium socii fuerunt in convictu, sic et, ubi simul egerint, cum suis sociis atque confratribus, ecclesiasticam in sua morte habeant sepulturam.

[16] *Oxford Deeds of Balliol*, p. 285, *sub* 570: Acta sunt ista in aula de Balliolo . . . die sancte Margarete virginis (25 July, 1325) . . . presentibus magistris sacre theologie doctoribus magistro Ricardo de Camsale et magistro Waltero de Horkestaw una cum magistris Ricardo filio Radulphi et Ricardo de Retford qui omnes quondam dicte domus socii extiterunt.

[17] *Snappe's Formulary*, p. 71: Memorandum quod xv Kal. Novembris anno domini MCCCXXII apud Quappelade magistri Ricardus de Camsale sacre theologie proffessor . . .

[18] J. M. Wilson, *The Worcester Liber Albus* (SPCK, London, 1920), p. 202.

[19] H. E. Salter, *The Cartulary of Oseney Abbey* III (OHS, Oxford, 1931), p. 154: A. (i.e. annual rent) xv s. Schole super seldas per mag. R. de Campsale.

[20] The event was evidently known to Warden Brodrick (*v. supra*, note 14) and has merited Campsall's name a place in the list of Vice-Chancellors given in *The Historical Register of the University of Oxford to the End of the Trinity Term* 1888 (Oxford, 1888), p. 21; the editors remark on the custom of appointing a temporary Vice-Chancellor for a particular act and Campsall's 1325 appointment is adduced as an instance of this procedure: the same incident is recounted in Brian Twyn, *Antiquitatis Academiae Oxoniensis Apologia* (Oxford, 1608), p. 302; it is referred to in Professor Powicke's notice, *v. supra*, note 2. I have given the date as 1325/26 because the process overlaps the 1 January, 1326 but contemporary notices, in accordance with the Mediaeval English calendar simply date it as 1325.

Our last certain notation on the career of Richard of Campsall is the information that he was buried in the choir of Saint John's Church, the chapel of Merton from 1292, in a grave which was still identifiable in the seventeenth century thanks to a marble slab which carried an inscription partly in Latin and partly in "Saxon" characters. Only the Latin portion has been transcribed and this, unfortunately, does not include the date of Campsall's death.[22] The marble slab has disappeared. About 1671 some stones from this part of the choir were moved to the transepts but a survey by the Merton authorities in 1890 failed to identify the tombstone of Richard of Campsall.[23] His burial in the Merton chapel, as we have already remarked, indicates that he remained a Fellow of Merton until his death and from this it must be concluded that he did not become a Franciscan as has been suggested.[24]

Hence the following dates, supported by secure documentary evidence, may be assigned for the career of Richard of Campsall:

(1) before 1306: Fellow of Balliol; after 1306: Fellow of Merton.
(2) 1308: Regent Master in Arts.
(3) 1322: Regent Master in Theology.
(4) 1325/26: *locum tenens* for the Chancellor.

This meagre outline, however, can be supplemented by some highly probable inferences. First, as to the date on which he became a Master in Theology. In February, 1314, the Chancellor, Henry of Harclay, and eleven Regent Masters in Theology condemned eight articles as heretical.[25] The phrasing of the record in the Chancellor's Book suggests that this solemn act at the Austin Friars was the work of all the Regent Masters of the faculty and it is improbable that any Regent Master in Theology could have abstained. Campsall's name is not among the signatures and hence it is probable that he was not a Master in Theology at that date. Since he had that grade in 1322, we have the period 1314-1322 as the period when he most likely attained that rank. Further, since we know that in 1308 he was a Regent in Arts and that for a Master in Arts to attain the full license in Theology required about nine years of study and academic exercises, we may assume that nine years of successful work in Theology ended for Campsall in the period 1314-1322, most likely between 1314 and 1317 since a later date would imply that he either took more than the usual time or did not at once begin the work leading to the degree of Master in Theology. Working back from this, we can assign the years 1305-1308 as the most probable for the attainment of the license in Arts. Since a Master in Arts had spent about three years from his "determination" as Bachelor,[26] Campsall's degree of Bachelor in Arts was most probably granted between 1302 and 1305 and we have seen that the document which refers to him as *Dominus*, the normal title of the Bachelor,[27] must be placed on other considerations before 1306. Because the age of students entering the University varied so widely, we can hardly work back to the date of his birth from these dates but it does not seem too much to assume that a date of birth in the penultimate decade of the thirteenth century would account for the probable dates of his various academic grades.

---

[21] The full text of the Notary's report of this incident is printed in H. Anstey, *Munimenta Academica* I, 'Libri Chancellarii et Procuratorum' (Rolls Series, London, 1868), pp. 113-117.

[22] J. Gutch, A. Wood, *The History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford* (Oxford, 1786), pp. 23-24; the text of the inscription given by the editors is: Orate pro anima Magistri Ricardi de Camsale sacre pagine professor . . . hic jacet tumulatum.

[23] This information also is available thanks to the courtesy of the librarian of Merton College who refers to H. Hurst, *An Account of the Sepulchral Monuments in the Chapel of Merton College* (M.S., 1890), p. 43.

[24] Thus Victorin Doucet, O.F.M. 'L'oeuvre scolastique de Richard de Conington, O.F.M.', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, xxix (1936), 420, note 4; recent information permits me to say that Father Doucet has abandoned this identification of Richard of Campsall as a Franciscan in favor of his identification as a diocesan cleric as proposed here.

[25] Anstey, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 100-102: Isti articuli subscripti fuerunt reprobati tanquam erronei a Magistris theologiae Universitatis Oxoniae anno Domini 1314 mense Februarii . . . Sciendum quod hi Magistri erant tunc regentes in theologia, qui omnes unanimi consensu decreverunt articulos praedictos esse haereticos . . .

[26] H. Rashdall, (F. M. Powicke, A. B. Emden edd.) *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* III (Oxford, 1936), pp. 158-159.

As for the date of his death, the evidence is even less satisfactory. The only reasonably secure evidence is based upon a catalogue of theological books in the Merton Library which Professor Powicke edited as "T" in the study we have had occasion to cite. This list includes the titles of five volumes and their previous owner is put down as Richard of Campsall.[28] Now since it is improbable that a professor should dispose of his books during his lifetime—and here we are dealing with the rare and enormously expensive mediaeval codices—and since it was provided by statute that a Fellow of Merton should leave his books to the College at his death,[29] we may infer that Campsall died before the catalogue was completed. The catalogue, unfortunately, is not dated, but the editor has tentatively assigned it to a point between 1350-1360 on the ground that it contains no mention of books which are known to have come to the College in the third quarter of the century.[30]

Consequently, the extreme dates 1280-1290 and 1350-1360 are submitted as probable dates for Richard of Campsall's birth and death.

---

[27] C. E. Mallet, *A History of the University of Oxford* I (London, 1924), p. 188, note 5; The clerk who did not proceed beyond the Bachelor's degree was styled *Dominus*, in English *Dan, Dompne* or *Sir* . . .

[28] Powicke, *op. cit.*, p. 3, where "T" is described as a catalogue of theological books containing 250 entries; p. 114 for the listing of the volumes which previously belonged to Richard of Campsall, a psalter, two volumes of Augustine, a volume of Anselm, and one of Hugh of St. Victor.

[29] *Injunctions of Archbishop Kilwardby, 1276*, ed. H. W. Garrod, (Oxford, 1929), p. 14: Condictum est insuper concessum et statutum ut scholares dictam domum ingressi et dictam domum ingredientes, Libri sui quos secum attulerint et Libros quos ibi commorantes perquisierint dictae domui remaneant in forma subscripta viz. ut si ii qui in eadem domo commorantes in fata decesserint, aero alieno onerentur, debita sua de bonis suis ac etiam de libris quis quatenus opus fuerit, per visum Custodis seu Vice-Custodis persolvantur. Residuum autem dictorum librorum, si quod fuerit, dictae domui remanebit. Si vero Religionis habitum assumpserint, Libri eorum dictae domui ad usum [Sociorum suorum] Scholarium suorum remaneant omnino. Quod si beneficium uberius aut gradum uberiorem assecuti fuerint, per quod extra dictam Societatem studio vacent, aut in suis Beneficiis recideant, aut etiam ad aliorum obsequium se transferant, Libros suos habeant ad usum suum ita quod in morte sua Libros suos aut justam compensationem dictae domui relinquant.

Cf. *ibid.*, p. 8, the remarks of the editor on the effect of these provisions: Kilwardby enacts, in effect, that the books of individual Fellows are ultimately the property of the College; and it is probably to this statutory injunction that the College owed its wealth of books which compares remarkably with that of similar institutions.

[30] Professor Powicke's reasons for this dating are given, *op. cit.*, p. 3: The date is 1350-60 . . . not before 1350 is proved by the inclusion of an entry describing Bradwardine's treatise *De Causa Dei* (no. 158) as 'summa domini Cantuariensis de causa dei contra pelagios', i.e. . . . after (his) . . . brief tenure . . . (as Archbishop of Canterbury) 1349 . . . the date is 1350-60, for none of the existing books which are known to have been given to the college in the third quarter of the century are mentioned.

II.

The following sparse indications may be given as to the works of Richard of Campsall:

(1) Every mediaeval Master in Theology had been a Bachelor of the *Sentences* and it is to be presumed that Richard of Campsall published his *Commentary on the Sentences* since references to his opinions found in contemporary authors seem to derive from such a *Commentary* with one exception. The single exception is a citation by Adam of Woodham of an opinion which he attributes to "Campsall and Ockham in their ordinary responses", i.e., in the academic exercise of *responsiones*.[31] But Campsall's *Commentary on the Sentences* is not known to be extant.

(2) A *Commentary on the Elements* of Euclid. This work, otherwise unknown, is mentioned by Holcot.[32]

(3) *XVI Dicta Venerabilis Ricardi de Capsalis.* This is a brief treatise on the divine foreknowledge, printed in the 1496 Bologna edition of the *Expositio Aurea* of William of Ockham and has been noted by Prantl[33] and Böhner.[34]

(4) *Questiones super 3 libr' phisicorum.* This work and the one following are listed in the catalogue of Saint Augustine's, Canterbury, under the name "Master Richard of Campsall" but the editor of the catalogue has not succeeded in finding any trace of them after the surrender of the monastery to the Crown.[35]

(5) *Notabilitates eiusdem super omnes libros phisicorum.*

(6) *Questiones dicte a Ricardo de Camsal super librum Priorum Analeticorum.* This work is extant in one manuscript, Gonville and Caius, 668*, fols. 76a-117b.[36] It has not, to my knowledge, been edited.

(7) *Logica Campsale Anglici valde utilis et realis contra Ocham.* This work, extant in one manuscript (v. *supra*, note 1), is written in answer to Ockham's *Summa Logicae* and contains the author's reply to all of the *pars prima* of Ockham's *Summa* but breaks off at the foot of a page refuting the *pars secunda*. The description *valde utilis et realis contra Ocham* is extremely apt; from the point of view of its utility to the anti-Ockhamist, the work undertakes to provide a counter-demonstration for each stage of the Venerable Inceptor's argument and all this is done in the name of a realism of common natures. Although the testimony of the single extant manuscript of the work is accepted in attributing this *Logica* to Richard of Campsall, the attribution must remain tentative until the problem presented by certain citations of Campsall in contemporary theologians has been resolved.

III.

If Campsall is almost unknown to us, he enjoyed no small fame among his own contemporaries and the tone of their citations suggests that his name was respected as well as known.

---

[31] *Ms* Vat. *Lat.* 955, fols. 182ᵛ-183ʳ: . . . et ideo sit ibi fallacia accidentis sicut dixit Campsale et Ockham in suis responsionibus ordinariis.

[32] *Ms* Cambridge, Pembroke College, (a quodlibetal question of Holcot), 236, fol. 152ᵛ: . . . Patet instantia, tertio Elementorum Euclidis, propositione 15 in Commento Camp. This reference, as well as that mentioned in note 40, is available thanks to Father Joseph Wey, C.S.B., Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto.

[33] C. Prantl, *Geschichte der Logik im Abendlande* IV (Leipzig, 1927), pp. 97-98; cf. note 387, p. 98. Prantl has followed the spelling "Capsalis" of the 1496 edition of the *Expositio Aurea* of Ockham in which the horizontal stroke over the letter "a" which would make the name "Campsalis" is missing.

[34] Ph. Böhner, O.F.M., *Tractatus de Praedestinatione et de Praescientia Dei et de Futuris Contingentibus of William Ockham* (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., 1945), p. 87.

[35] M. R. James, *op. cit.*, p. 363: Questiones magri Rici de Campsale super 3 libr' phisicorum / Notabilitates breves eiusdem super omnes libros phisicorum.

[36] M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Gonville and Caius College* II (Cambridge, 1908), pp. 665 sqq.

To begin with the most obscure, three anonymous *Commentaries on the Sentences,* all three as yet unedited, contain references to the opinions of Campsall. One of these, preserved in a Florence manuscript, contains a solution of the question: Whether the will is a free or necessary principle of its own acts? which is identified as the response of Campsall.[37] Another, extant in a Vatican manuscript, informs us that an English doctor named Campsall held that intuitive and abstractive knowledge are the same, but in succession and not simultaneously.[38] The third, also in a Vatican manuscript, is described as containing references to the same author.[39]

In addition to these citations in anonymous works, four known authors have referred to the teaching of Campsall and research will undoubtedly multiply such references. The first of the four is Robert Holcot, O.P. (*d.* 1349), who, in his *Commentary on the Sentences,* reports our author as holding that "if no rose exists, the proposition 'a rose is understood' is false".[40] The same author, in a quodlibetal question refers to a *Commentary* on the third book of the *Elements* of Euclid by an author whose name, as abbreviated by the scribe, seems to be Campsall.[41] Reference to this otherwise unknown work of Campsall has already been made in the listing of his works.

The English Carmelite, John Baconthorp, "recites" an Ockhamist opinion in his *Commentary on the Sentences* and the marginal notation in one manuscript, "Camsale", has suggested that this opinion is to be attributed to our author.[42] But this opinion, which comes from the *Summa Logicae* of Ockham, is expressly refuted by the author of the *Logica* attributed to Campsall. This is the first considerable objection to the definitive attribution of the *Logica* to Richard of Campsall but it is not impossible to resolve the apparent opposition. Since it is simply a marginal notation, the word "Camsale" might well be intended to suggest a source for the refutation of the Ockhamist position.[43]

Both the 1512 Paris edition of Adam of Woodham's *Commentary on the Sentences* as abbreviated by Henry de Oyta and the Vatican manuscript of the original work[44] contain references to Campsall which appear to be derived from that theologian's *Commentary on the Sentences.* It is of some interest that one reveals Campsall as something of a practical psychologist in his reflections on acquired habits which result in well-behaved dogs and children and on whether such habits affect the freedom of the will;[45] another presents under our author's name the position that since virtue is concerned with what is difficult, it increases in proportion to the difficulty it overcomes;[46] in another an *ars Camsale* is set out for the detection of certain paralogisms in the theological exposition of the Trinity and this use of Logic in Theology is attributed both to Ockham and to Campsall "in their ordinary responses"[47]—an association of the two names which must be considered in resolving the problem of the attribution of the *Logica*.

---

[37] *Ms* Flor. Nat., *conv. sopp.* A. 3.508, fols 147^{c}-154^{d}.

[38] *Ms* Vat. Lat. 4284, fols. 1^{a}-188^{b}; fol. 52^{a}: Quidam doctor Anglicus qui vocatur campsale ponit quod eadem res est notitia intuitiva et abstractiva, successive tamen et non simul.

[39] *Ms* Vat. *Lat.* 986; cf. Pelzer, *Codices Vaticani Latini* I, p. 458; the reference to our theologian as "Compsaley" occurs on fol. 28^{v}.

[40] A text established by Father Wey, (*v. supra,* note 32) by comparing *Ms* Balliol 71, fol. 145^{a}, Oriel 15, fol. 206^{va}, and B. M. *Royal* 10.C. vi, fol. 130^{b} of Holcot's *Commentary* reads: Tenet Campsale quod haec est falsa: 'rosa intelligitur', rosa non existente, et sua opposita est vera, viz. 'nulla rosa intelligitur' . . .

[41] *v. supra,* note 32; the abbreviation "Camp" should, it seems, be read "Campsale", if for no other reason, for want of another name which it would fit.

[42] B. M. Xiberta, *De magistro Iohanne Baconthorp O. Carmelitarum* (Rome, 1927), p. 117: Est alius qui reputat se hoc efficaciter demonstrare, CAMSALE [Richardus Campsall], sic: Si relatio esset alia res a fundamento, igitur tot res generantur unico actu quo relationes; sed quando moveo digitum acquiruntur infinitae relationes, quia acquiruntur infinitae distantiae . . . et sic apparens inopinabile sequitur, quod ad motum digiti unius impleretur mundus infinitis rebus[4]. Note 4: *In i Sent.,* d. 28, q. 1. Nomen doctoris legitur tantum in margine codicis Londonensis.

[43] The argument is termed an Ockhamist position on the strength of its appearance in the Venerable Inceptor's *Summa Logicae* I. 50, in the ed. of Ph. Böhner O.F.M., (St. Bonaventure, N.Y., Louvain, 1951), p. 145. ll. 8-16; the answer in the *Logica* attributed to Campsall is to be found on fol. 64^{r}, l. 41-64^{v}, l. 5.

[44] The printed "abbreviatio" referred to is: Adam de Wodham, *Lectura in Libros Sententiarum, Opus ab Henrico de Oyta Contractum* (Paris, 1512); a copy of this work is preserved in the Paris Bibl. Nat., *R XVI* 662 The Vatican manuscript referred to is: Vat. *Lat.* 955.

[45] Vat. *Lat.* 955, fol. 39^{v}.

Campsall's name, along with those of many other contemporary theologians, appears eight times in the very elaborate table of contents of one Paris manuscript of the *Commentary on the Sentences* of Walter of Chatton, O.F.M.[48] This author's citations of Campsall raise the same problem as does that of Baconthorp with respect to the authenticity of the *Logica*. Walter of Chatton attributes five opinions to Campsall and of the five, two can be controlled by comparison with the *Logica*—first, Whether God is in a genus? and second, Whether there exist real relations? In each case the "Ockhamist" position—that God is in a genus and that there are no real relations—is attributed by Chatton's scribe to Richard of Campsall whereas the opposite solutions are proposed and defended by the author of the *Logica*.[49] The thorny question, therefore, of the doctrinal orientation of Campsall involves the solution of the problem posed by the attribution of the anti-Ockhamist *Logica* to this theologian and the attribution to the same man of definitively Ockhamist positions by the Baconthorp and Chatton manuscripts. At the present stage of research no categorical answer is possible.

---

[46] *Ibid.*, fols. 39^{r}; 39^{v}; cf. fol. 33^{r}.

[47] *Ibid.*, fols. 182^{v}, 183^{r}; *v. supra*, note 31.

[48] The manuscript referred to is Paris, Bibl. Nat., *Lat.* 15887; cf. L. Baudry, Gauthier de Chatton et son commentaire des Sentences', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge* XIV (1943-1945), 335-339; Baudry mentions that Campsall's name is cited "five times" (p. 345), actually it occurs eight times.

[49] *Ms cit.*, fol. 3^{rb}, ll. 32-33; fol. 35^{rb}, ll. 21-34 and fol. 62^{va}, ll. 42-46; the author of the *Logica* takes a negative position on the first issue, (*v. supra*, note 1), fol. 26^{r}, ll. 9-11; Ad primum istorum dico quod Deus non est in genere, neque ab eo potest abstrahi conceptus 'differentiae'—loquendo de 'differentia' proprie dicta—et per consequens nec sibi competit definitio. He denies the second, fol. 60^{r}, ll. 16-21: Quantum ad primum dico quod relatio realis est aliquid praecedens omnem intentionem, etiam duratione, ducens intellectum de necessitate naturae secundum se totum ad cognoscendum aliquid ab ipso distinctum realiter.

Mary Legends in Italian Manuscripts in the Major Libraries of Italy

SISTER MARY VINCENTINE GRIPKEY S.C.L.

I. Manuscripts of Mary Legends in Italian: Group I.

1. INTRODUCTORY SURVEY

IN his monumental work, 'Studien zu den mittelalterlichen Marienlegenden,'[1] Adolf Mussafia listed Mary legends in Latin and Old French which are found in manuscript form in the libraries on the continent. H. L. D. Ward analyzed the contents of similar manuscripts in the British Museum, and J. A. Herbert supplemented this catalogue[2] after examining Mary legends inserted in the *exempla* of writers of the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries. A. Poncelet in his *Index miraculorum*[3] registered the *initia* of almost two thousand Marian tales found in the Latin collections prior to the fifteenth century. Louis Villecourt[4] has made a study of the legends in Arabic. Frequently manuscript collections are described in notes appended to the various editions of Mary legends.[5]

No scholar had investigated the Mary legends in Italian until Ezio Levi d'Ancona in the introduction to *Il libro dei cinquanta miracoli della Vergine*[6] made a survey of manuscripts containing the 'miracoli della Madonna.' He listed thirty-seven to be found in the libraries of Italy. It was not his purpose to analyze the individual legends. Although he gave the prologues to such collections as have them, and occasionally presented the titles of legends and their *incipits*, the identification is usually too vague for the careful scholar. Moreover, he failed to show accurately the rélation between the manuscripts and omitted several of importance.

This study will supplement the information given by Levi, omitting a description of manuscripts already given in his work or in inventories indicated by him, and attempting to arrange the manuscripts in related groups. To his list of thirty-seven manuscripts two most important for the subject of manuscript relations have been added: *Mss* Florence, Bib. Medicea Laurenziana *Ashburnham* 546 and Milan, Bib. Ambrosiana P. 172 sup. Included also are two of minor importance: *Mss* Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1354 and Riccardiana 1676.[7] Manuscript sigla adopted by Levi, even for the manuscripts of the Vatican Library, are retained and whenever possible the captions of the various legends are those first used by Mussafia and Ward.

Mussafia divided the earliest of the Latin legends into three groups: (1) *HM*.

---

[1] *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wein* (phil.-hist. Kl.), CXIII (1886); CXV (1887); CXIX (1889); CXXIII (1890); CXXXIX (1898). These articles are here designated as *Studien* I, II, III, IV, V.

[2] *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum* II (London, 1890); *ibid.*, III (London, 1910).

[3] 'Miraculorum B. Virginis Mariae quae saec. VI-XV latine conscripta sunt index postea perficiendus,' *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXI (1902), 214-360.

[4] 'Les collections arabes des miracles de la sainte Vierge,' *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLII (1924), 31-68, 266-87.

[5] The most recent edition is that of Evelyn Faye Wilson who also makes a thorough study of collections of Mary legends made in Northern France in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, cf. *The* Stella Maris *of John of Garland* (Mediaeval Academy of America Publication, 45, Cambridge, Mass., 1946), pp. 3-76.

[6] Bologna, 1917, pp.liv-lxxxiii.

[7] The writer had to discontinue her research at the outbreak of the war in 1939. She did not examine *Mss* Verona, Bib. Comunale 1224 (V^2) and Rome, Bib. Angelica 1983 (*Ra*). Fortunately, the one legend in the Veronese manuscript can be identified from Levi's description (cf. *infra*, Group I, n.128); *Ra* contains miraculous occurences localized at Lucca and unrelated to the legends considered in this study (cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 107 and n. 184).

a series of seventeen legends, beginning with the 'Hildefonsus' legend and ending with 'Murieldis'; (2) the series of four elements with the 'Jew of Bourges' (fire), 'Theophilus' (air), 'Childbirth in the Sea' (water), and 'Julian and St. Basil' (earth); (3) *TS*, a series of seventeen, beginning with the 'Toledo' legend and ending with 'Saturday'. He used as the starting point of his investigations a collection which he designated as Pez,[8] and which in its original form consisted of forty-two numbers.

These legends of the eleventh and twelfth centuries recur in later Latin and Old French collections in almost the same arrangement. However, those in Italian are later in date, and while the compilers frequently include these popular legends, they no longer observe the original order. During the last decades of the fourteenth century and the early part of the fifteenth, the compilations were enriched with many tales from vernacular collections and cloister records. Heterogeneous as they may seem, it is possible to divide the Italian manuscripts into at least four groups in which a series of tales recur in the same sequence.

Group I: a series of eighty-one legends called the *Libro del Naufragio* found in *Mss* Florence, Bib. Medicea Laurenziana *Ashburnham* 546, Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1284, Vatican City, Vat. *Barberiniano lat.* 4032, Milan, Bib. Ambrosiana P. 172 sup., Rome, Bib. Casanatense 281, and also in part in the shorter *Mss* Florence, Bib. Naz. *Palatino* LIII and *Palatino* CXXXVII, Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1345 and Riccardiana 1406.

Group II: a series of thirty-three legends found in *Mss* Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1431, Riccardiana 1408, and used in part by the compilers of Florence, Bib. Naz. *Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70, Florence, Bib. Naz. *Palatino* LXXIII, Vatican City, Vat. *Barberiniano lat.* 4032, and Vatican City, Vat. *lat.* 8085.

Group III: a series called the *Libro del Cavaliere* found in most Italian incunabula, in *Mss* Naples, Bib. Naz. xii.F.25, Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220, and used by the compilers of Florence, Bib. Naz. *Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70, Vatican City, Vat. *Barberiniano lat.* 4032, and Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1277.

Group IV: a series found in the first parts of *Mss* Florence, Bib. Naz. *Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70, and Vatican City, Vat. *Barberiniano lat.* 4032.

Group V: occasional Mary legends in twenty-one miscellaneous manuscripts.

2. ANALYSIS OF GROUP I.

FLa^2—*Ashburnham* 546, an early fifteenth-century manuscript, acquired by the Italian government in 1884 from the successor to the Earl of Ashburnham, is now in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana at Florence.[9] The eighty-one legends occupy the first ninety-two folios.

Fr^3—Riccardiano 1284,[10] also at Florence in the Biblioteca Riccardiana, is a fifteenth-century manuscript, containing eighty-one[11] Mary legends on fols. 2-79^v. The first folio is mutilated.

Ma—Ambrosiano P. 172 sup., a fifteenth-century manuscript, once in the possession of Frederic Cardinal Borromeo[12] and now in the Biblioteca Ambrosiana at Milan, contains eighty-two legends of the Blessed Virgin on fols. 1-81.

---

[8] *Studien* I, pp. 22-30 and III, p. 5. The Latin collection, published by Bernhard Pez in 1731, has been reprinted by Thomas Frederick Crane, *Liber de miraculis sanctae Dei genitricis Mariae* (Ithaca, 1925).

[9] A perusal of *Ms Ashburnham* 546 reveals no clue as to the compiler, copyist, or exact date. The first indication of ownership is on the protective leaf of parchment, where Giovanni Mazzuoli, called 'Lo Stradino,' leaves this note: El qual libro lo chavai di Parma quando pigliamo d'essa la parte di là dal fiume chol . . . esercito della Santità di N. S. Leone decimo. This would be before 1515 as Leo X (Pope 1513-1521) withdrew papal troops from Parma in that year, when for political reasons Parma passed into the hands of Francis I of France. The manuscript, written in Italy in an early fifteenth-century hand, consists of 139 leaves of paper. The first six folios and fol. 139 are blurred by humidity; although the first folio is mutilated, the legend can be identified. Fol. 31 is blank but the tale continues on 32. There is imperfect foliation after fol. 24, running 24, 26, 25, 27. Fol. 93 begins the life of St. Mary of Egypt, and lives of other saints follow.

[10] S. Morpurgo, *I manoscritti della R. Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze: I codici italiani* I (Rome, 1900), p. 344; Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxiii.

[11] Levi, following the error of Morpurgo, gives eighty, *loc. cit.*

Rc—Casanatense 281 (formerly C.iv.4),[13] an early fifteenth-century manuscript, containing eight-three 'miracles' on fols. 4-117, is in the Biblioteca Casanatense at Rome.

Rv^3—Vat. *Barb. lat.* 4032 (formerly xvl.128) in the Vatican Library is a compilation of 187 legends (fols. 11-123) made by Duccio di Gano of Pisa in the late fourteenth or more probably in the fifteenth century.[14] Nos. 128-187 are from this series.

Fp^2—*Palatino* LIII, a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence, contains forty-one[15] Marian tales (fols. 1-56) of which thirty-nine are from Group I.

Fr^5—Riccardiano 1345,[16] a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Biblioteca Riccardiana at Florence, is the work of a Brigittine Nun (fol. 90). It contains forty-three legends (fols. 121-147), thirty-six being from Group I.

Fp^4—*Palatino* CXXXVII[17] is a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence, containing six 'miracles' (fols. 23^v-38^v) of which four are from Group I, and two in Group IV.

Fr^6—Riccardiano 1406 in the Biblioteca Riccardiana is dated 1460.[18] It contains two legends from Group I (fols. 78-82^v).

3. THE CONTENT OF EACH LEGEND IN GROUP I.

1. PILGRIM IN THE SEA.[19] Pilgrims bound for Jerusalem are shipwrecked. From his small boat a bishop sees their souls ascend to heaven in the form of doves. One pilgrim calls upon Mary who wraps her cloak about him and brings him to

---

[12] The manuscript was formerly in the possession of the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine at the Convent of S. Maria Annunciata in Porta Nuova in Milan (fol. 81^v). In 1603 it was given as a gift to Frederic Cardinal Borromeo who founded the Ambrosian Library in 1609. It is written in various hands with changes of script on fols. 19, 33, 33^v, 41, 49, and 67. Fols. 17-8, 30-2, and 40^v are lined but blank.

[13] Levi, *op. cit.*, pp. lxix-lxxv.

[14] *Ibid.*, pp. lxxix; D. Sante Pieralisi, *Inventarium codicum mss. Bibliothecae Barberinae* XVI (Rome, *ca.* 1902), p. 126. For Duccio di Gano and the date of Rv^3, cf. *infra*, Group IV.

[15] L. Gentile, *I codici Palatini* I (Rome, 1889), p. 61; Levi, *op. cit.*, pp. lix-lx. There are forty-one, not forty-three tales, as Levi records. Fol. 71 reads: Iste liber scrisit B.V.M. unius fratres (*sic*) fraternitas sancte B. orate pro eo. It is possible that the copyist was a Brigittine monk, cf. *infra*, n.16.

[16] S. Morpurgo, *op. cit.*, p. 405; Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxiv. The supposition, that Fr^5 is the work of a Nun of the Order of St. Bridget, is based upon the words on fol. 90: Sermone angielicho revelato dall' angielo alla nostra madre Santa Bricida. The Monastery of Paradiso near Florence, founded in 1394 both for men and women, was a very active literary center at the beginning of the fifteenth century; cf. *Mss* Riccardiano 1267 (fol. 190), 1507 (fol. 146), and 1625 (fol. 120); *Palatino* XLIV (fol. 183^v), LIX (fol. 158), and CXLII (fol. 1).

[17] L. Gentile, *op. cit.*, I, p. 124; Levi, *op. cit.*, pp. lx-lxi. Giovanni Tortoli has printed the six 'miracles' in his uncritical edition, *Miracoli della Madonna e storia della Samaritana* (Florence, 1898).

[18] S. Morpurgo, *op. cit.*, pp. 444-5; Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxiv. The copyist and date are known: Questo libro è di Bernardo di Iachopo di Piero di messer Antonio Machiavelli; el quale schrissi di mia propia mano a onore di Dio l'anno 1460. Deo grazias. See P. Litta, *Celebri famiglie italiane* V (Milan, 1819-1852), Tavola I, no pagination, for Antonio Machiavelli, married to Lisa di Piero and eldest son of Lorenzo Machiavelli, who was a public figure in Florence as late as 1439; also for Bernardo Machiavelli (b. 1428), jurist and father of the famous Niccolò Machiavelli (b. 1469).

[19] Because T. F. Crane in his reprint of Pez and in his notes to *Ms* Cornell B. 14 in 'Miracles of the Virgin,' *Romanic Review* (indicated hereafter as *RR*), II (1911), 235-79 has made an exhaustive survey of variants in Latin and vernacular collections; and more recently Evelyn Faye Wilson in her notes to *The* Stella Maris *of John of Garland* gives a complete list of variants, the writer will frequently refer to these and to other scholarly editions of Mary legends. Precise indications will be made only to very early versions of the legend or to a particular collection which was in all probability the source, or to a collection omitted by editors. For 'Pilgrim in the Sea' cf. Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* (Venice, 1494), VII, 88; Pez, no. 27, pp. 93-4; *RR*, II, no. 2, 242-3; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 10, pp. 166-7. To these references may be added Richard Becker, *Gonzalos Milagros und ihre Grundlagen mit einem Anhange: Mitteilungen aus der lat. Hs. Kopenhagen, Thott 128* (Strassburg, 1910), no. 24, pp. 81 ff.

land. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 1 (incomplete in its present mutilated state); *Fr*^{3} (fol. 1 is missing but the last part of the legend on fol. 2 shows correspondence); *Ma*, fol. 1; *Rc*, fol. 4; *Rv*^{3}, no. 128, fol. 65^v; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 1; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 121.

2. LIGHT ON THE MASTHEAD.[20] During a storm on the 'mare di Bretagna' passengers on board a ship invoke various saints. A bishop prevails upon them to pray to the Blessed Virgin. Thereupon a light appears above the mast and the storm ceases. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 1; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 2; *Ma*, fol. 1^v; *Rc*, fol. 5^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 129, fol. 66; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 2; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 121^v.

3. HOURS SUNG DAILY.[21] A clerk, visiting a monastery, is surprised to find the Hours of the Virgin sung in solemn chant. He is told by a monk that it is in gratitude to Mary who interceded for him in a vision of judgment which prompted him to amend his life. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 1^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 2^v; *Ma*, fol. 2^v; *Rc*, fol. 6; *Rv*^{3}, no. 130, fol. 66^v; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 3; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 122.

4. 120 *Aves* DAILY; SAVED FROM DROWNING.[22] A young girl accustomed to salute Mary by saying 120 *Aves* daily is requested by the Virgin to say the prayers more slowly, particularly the words, *Dominus tecum*, and to prepare for her death within eight days. Because of the vision the girl's mother hangs a picture of Mary in a place of honor. When her son falls into the river, she has recourse to the Virgin and sees him walk upon the water to safety. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 2^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 3^v; *Ma*, fol. 4; *Rc*, fol. 7; *Rv*^{3}, no. 131, fol. 67; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 4^v; *Fr*^{5}, omitted; *Fp*^{4}, fol. 28^v.

5. TWO DEVILS IN PRISON.[23] At the instigation of the evil spirit a monk and a pious woman are led to elope. Overtaken, they are placed in prison. Because of their deep contrition Mary releases them and makes two devils take their place. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 3^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 4; *Ma*, fol. 4; *Rc*, omitted; *Rv*^{3}, no. 132, fol. 68; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 5; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 122^v.

6. ROBBER SLAPPED.[24] Thieves in England attempt to remove a gold image of the Christ-Child from a statue of the Virgin. They are felled by a blow from her hand and her arm remains extended until they are chastised. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 6; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 5^v; *Ma*, fol. 6; *Rc*, fol. 8; *Rv*^{3}, no. 133, fol. 69; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 7^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 123^v.

7. PAINTER: BABY SAVED.[25] This is a strange combination of two unrelated tales. The devil, enraged to find an artist painting him most hideous and the Virgin most beautiful, blows down the scaffolding. The Virgin in the picture stretches out her arm and saves the artist. A mother, bathing her babe in lukewarm water over a stove, leaves the child while she investigates a crash outside her home. When she returns, the water is boiling, but the baby is uninjured. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 6; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 5^v; *Ma*, fol. 6; *Rc*, fol. 8^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 8; *Fr*^{5}, omitted; *Fp*^{4}, fol. 29^v.

8. BARNS FILLED.[26] During a period of famine, monks in an abbey in Jerusalem

---

[20] Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, vii, 89. Cf. Pez, no. 28, p. 94; *RR*, II, no. 3, 243-4; R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 25, p. 83. In the Latin and Old French collections the first and second tales are usually found as one or in sequence. See Jean Miélot, *Miracles de Nostre Dame*, ed. G. F. Warner for the Roxburghe Club (Westminster, 1885), no. xxxiii where the two legends are combined.

[21] Cf. Pez, no. 34, p. 98; Introduction to Miélot. no. xxxv: E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 23, pp. 180-1. See also *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 65.

[22] This is a variant of the 'Eulalia' legend in which 150 *Aves* are said daily, cf. Mussafia, *Studien* I, 942, no. 32: Pez, no. 32, p. 97; *infra*, Groups II, 6 and III, 7. The sequel, 'Saved from Drowning,' is peculiar to Group I of this study.

[23] The tale is related by Jacques de Vitry (*ca.* 1180-1240). For a conspectus of the history of this legend cf. *The Exempla or Illustrative Stories from the* Sermones Vulgares *of Jacques de Vitry*, ed. T. F. Crane (London, 1890), no. ccxxxii, pp. 256-7. Variants are also listed by Alfons Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach* III (Bonn, 1937), 175, n. 55. See also the Italian version, *Miracoli della gloriosa Vergine Maria*, ed. Piero Misciattelli (Milan, 1929), no. 59, pp. 154-9; *infra*, Groups III, 59 and V, *Fn*^{6}, *Fp*^{3}, no. 30, and *Fr*^{1}, no. 6.

[24] T. F. Crane, *ibid.*, no. cclxxvi, pp. 115-6 with variants on p. 255. Cf. *infra*, Groups II, 19, and V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 133.

[25] The 'Painter' is a popular Mary legend, cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 54, pp. 204-5; A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 184, no. 63; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 74, p. 68 and no. 45, p. 280. Cf. P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 10, pp. 23-4; *infra*, Group II, 14 and III, 10. The two tales in combination are found in *Ms* Riccardiano 1675, fols. 67-8; cf. *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{10}. no. 81.

[26] The earliest appearance of the legend is *In Gloria martyrum* of Gregory of Tours, cf. *Gregorii Turonensis opera* II, ed. Wilhelm Arndt and Bruno Krusch (Hanover, 1885),

pray to Mary and find their barns filled with wheat with which they are able to take care of the poor. FLa^{2}, fol. 7; Fr^{3}, fol. 6^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 7; *Rc*, fol. 9^{v}; Rv^{3}, no. 134, fol. 69^{v}; Fp^{2}, fol. 9; Fr^{5}, fol. 124.

9. ALEXIUS IN THE MINE.[27] Emperor Aloya (Alexius III of Constantinople), while seeking silver and gold in a mine, is imprisoned by a fall of earth. Angels, at the command of the Virgin, supply his wants for a year during which his wife, the Empress Giordana, has daily Mass said for him. At the end of this time Mary instructs the bishop how to find him. FLa^{2}, fol. 8; Fr^{3}, fol. 7; *Ma*, fol. 8; *Rc*, fol. 10^{v}; Rv^{3}, no. 135, fol. 70; Fp^{2}, fol. 10^{v}; Fr^{5}, fol. 125^{v}; Fp^{4}, fol. 32.

10. DROWNED SACRISTAN.[28] A sacristan is drowned and because of his dissolute life is buried in unconsecrated ground. Mary appears to an elderly monk and orders that his body be buried honorably. As a sign of his repentance he will find three lilies growing from his mouth and upon his tongue the words *Ave Maria* in letters of gold. FLa^{2}, fol. 9; Fr^{3}, fol. 8; *Ma*, fol. 9; *Rc*, omitted; Rv^{3}, no. 136, fol. 71; Fp^{2}, fol. 12; Fr^{5}, fol. 125^{v}.

11. MILK.[29] A canon named Caterio, devoted to Mary, suffers from cancer of the lips and tongue. They are healed when she anoints them with the milk of her breast. FLa^{2}, fol. 10; Fr^{3}, fol. 8^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 9^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 12; Rv^{3}, no. 137, fol. 71^{v}; Fp^{2}, fol. 12^{v}; Fr^{5}, fol. 126.

12. VISION OF MARY WITH STS. MARTIN AND NICHOLAS.[30] The Virgin, accompanied by the Saints Martin and Nicholas, awakens a monk to chant the Office. Afterwards, because of his devotion, she foretells his happiness in eternity. FLa^{2}, fol. 10^{v}; Fr^{3}, fol. 9; *Ma*, fol. 10; *Rc*, fol. 12^{v}; Rv^{3}, no. 138, fol. 72; Fp^{2}, fol. 13^{v}; Fr^{5}, fol. 126^{v}.

13. LOVE BY BLACK ART.[31] A virtuous clerk wins the love of a young girl by renouncing his faith in a pact with the evil spirit. Having refused to deny the Mother of God, he is granted a vision of Mary at his wedding feast. Repentant, he obtains permission from the bishop to put away his bride and gives himself up to the service of God. FLa^{2}, fol. 11^{v}; Fr^{3}, fol. 10; *Ma*, fol. 11; *Rc*, fol. 14; Rv^{3}, no. 139, fol. 72^{v}; Fp^{2}, fol. 14^{v}; Fr^{5}, fol. 127.

14. MARY'S NAME IN GOLD LETTERS.[32] A monk scribe always letters the name of Mary in gold. Before his death she appears to tell him that his name is written in the Book of Life. FLa^{2}, fol. 13^{v}; Fr^{3}, fol. 12; *Ma*, fol. 12^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 16^{v}; Rv^{3}, no. 140, fol. 74; Fp^{2}, fol. 17^{v}; Fr^{5}, fol. 128^{v}.

---

pp. 494-5 (9). Using Gregory as his source, Flodoard (895-966) gives a metrical version in his work, *De triumphis Christi et ss. Palaestinae* I, 4; PL, 125, 495-6. For variants cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 6, pp. 160-1; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 26, p. 275. See also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 21, pp. 59-60; *infra*, Group III, 21.

[27] The tale is told as early as the eleventh century by Peter Damian (d. 1072) in his *Opusc. XXXIII: De Bono suffragiorum*, 5; PL 145, 567, and in the twelfth century by Peter the Venerable (d. 1156) in *De Miraculis* II, 2; PL, 189, 911. Cf. *RR*, II, no. 6, 246; J. Morawski, 'Mélanges de littérature pieuse: Les miracles de Notre-Dame en vers français, I-III.' *Romania*, LXI (1935), 320, n. 5.

[28] There are several versions of the 'Drowned Sacristan.' These are given exhaustive treatment by Franz Ritter, *Die Legende vom ertrunkenen Glöckner* (Strassburg, 1913); more briefly Crane makes a study of the distinctive features of each version in *RR*, II, no. 8, 249. See also E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 178-80.

[29] Mussafia, *Studien* I, 44, notes that the miracle is recorded of an inhabitant of Nevers, named Gregory in the *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. 14463 (*SV*). This agrees with the text of Rv^{3}, fol. 71^{v}: Fu uno venerabile canonico o vero diacano della chiesa nivernense il quale ebbe nome Caterio (Chaterico in *Rc*). See also P. Misciattelli,*op. cit.*, no. 73, pp. 217-9 and *infra*, Group III, 73. For variants cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 1, pp. 155-6; *RR*, II, no. 12, 254.

[30] Cf. *infra*, Group III, 74.

[31] Cf. the story of the Senator Proterius in the *Vita sancti Basilii;* PL, 73, 302-5, or the version in the Italian *Ms* Florence, Bib. Naz. II. IV. 56 (fols. 187-8^{v}). Very similar to no. 13 is that of *Ms* British Museum *Royal* 20 B xiv printed by Mussafia together with the versions of William of Malmesbury and Adgar; cf. *Studien* IV, 53 ff. Cf. Pez, no. 35, pp. 98-9; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-4.

[32] In most of the tales Mary's name is written in three colors: auro, minio, croco; cf. Etienne de Bourbon, *Anecdotes historiques, légendes et apologues tirés du recueil inédit*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche (Paris, 1877), no. 130, pp. 119-20: Mussafia, *Studien* V, 37-8. For variants cf. *RR*, II, no. 17, 258-9; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 28, p. 50.

15. Will for Deed.[33] A rich knight, worldly but very charitable and devoted to the Virgin and to St. Michael, vows to build a monastery in their honor. He dies before his intention is carried out. Through Mary's intercession he receives the merit of his promise and the monk's cowl. *FLa*^{2}. fol. 14; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 12^v; *Ma*, fol. 13; *Rc*, fol. 17; *Rv*^{3}, no. 141, fol. 74^v; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 18^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 128^v; *Fp*^{4}, fol. 34^v.

16. Knight and Squire.[34] As a knight is thrown from his horse, his squire utters a prayer to the Virgin to preserve him. The knight, uninjured, refuses to acknowledge the favor and a few moments later is again thrown and killed. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 15^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 13^v; *Ma*, fol. 14^v; *Rc*, fol. 19; *Rv*^{3}, no. 142, fol. 76; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 20^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 129^v.

17. Abbot Elsinus.[35] A storm at sea overtakes Elsinus, Abbot of the Abbey of Ramsey in England, when he is returning from a mission to Denmark. A man appears in pontifical robes and enjoins him to celebrate the Feast of the Immaculate Conception each year on December 8. He promises to do so and the storm ceases. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 16; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 14; *Ma*, fol. 14^v; *Rc*, fol. 19^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 21; *Fr*^{5}, omitted.

18. Drowned Sacristan.[36] A sacristan drowns and would have been damned had not his soul, through the intercession of Mary, been restored to his body that he may do penance. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 17; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 15; *Ma*, fol. 15; *Rc*, omitted; *Rv*^{3}, omitted, the compiler having already inserted the story as no. 65;[37] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 22; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 129^v.

19. Charitable Almsman.[38] A poor man is rewarded by a vision of Mary on his death-bed because he has always shared his alms with others poorer than himself. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 18; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 15^v; *Ma*, fol. 16; *Rc*, fol. 21; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[39] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 24; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 130^v.

20. Bread to the Christ-Child.[40] While his mother is praying before a statue of the Madonna and Child, a little boy offers the Infant Jesus a piece of bread. The image deigns to speak when the boy cries because his offer is not accepted and promises that he will eat with Him in heaven within three days. The child dies as foretold. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 18^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 16; *Ma*, fol. 16^v; *Rc*, fol. 21^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[41] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 24^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 130^v.

21. Severed Hand.[42] Caesarius of Rome becomes Pope. A woman kisses his hand and to remove all temptations against chastity he cuts it off. The Roman populace demands that he celebrate Mass. His trust in Mary procures from her

---

[33] See the Italian version of Casimiro Stolfi (ed.), *Corona de' monaci compilato da un monaco degli Angeli* (Prato, 1862), no. 84, pp. 200-1. Cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 55, pp. 205-6; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 69, pp. 66-7.

[34] Cf. P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 34, pp. 88-9; *infra*, Group III, 34.

[35] The legend of 'Elsinus' is found in the spurious works of St. Anselm, *Sermo de Conceptione Beatae Mariae;* PL, 159, 319; *Miraculum de Conceptione Sanctae Mariae; ibid.*, 324. Elsinus was the Abbot of St. Augustine's in Canterbury, but he is mentioned as Abbot of Ramsey both by William of Malmesbury (see Mussafia, *Studien* IV, 19) and by Wace, *The Conception Nostre Dame*, ed. William R. Ashford (Chicago, 1933), pp. 1-11. Cf. Pez, no. 19, p. 90; *RR*, II, no. 18, 259-60; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 34, pp. 188-9

[36] Walter of Cluny who wrote his *De Miraculis S. Mariae Virginis* after 1141 inserts this version, cap. 4; PL 173, 1384. Cf. Pez, no. 2, pp. 82-3; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 36, pp. 179-80. Add to these indications of variants, R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 2, p. 61; *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 25.

[37] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 65.

[38] Cf. Pez, no. 5, p. 84; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 48, p. 198. See also R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 5, p. 62; *infra*, Group V, *Fp*^{3}, no. 28 and *Fr*^{10}, nos. 5 and 123.

[39] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 32 and 56.

[40] The legend agrees with the account of Walter of Cluny, *op. cit.*, 3; PL 173, 1383-4, and that of Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, VII, 99. Cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 49, pp. 198-9; *infra*, Group II, 18.

[41] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 126.

[42] As in the version of James of Voragine, Caesarius takes the name of Leo I as Pope (440-461), cf. *Legenda aurea*, cap. 88, ed. T. Graesse (Leipzig, 1850), p. 367. Cf. Mussafia, *Studien* I, 75 and II, 4 and 88; *RR*, II, no. 19, 261-2; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 29, p. 50, and no. 54, p. 62. See also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 38, pp. 105-8; *infra*, Groups III, 38 and V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 61.

the restoration of the hand. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 19^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 16^v; *Ma*, fol. 17;[43] *Rc*, fol. 22^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[44] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 25^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 131.

22. Prefect of Rome.[45] A priest rears an orphan boy, who on his death-bed promises to appear to him after death. The boy keeps his promise and his spirit takes the priest to the church of St. Agnes in Rome to assist at a Mass celebrated by St. Peter and attended by the Virgin and her retinue of saints and angels. The Mass over, the priest witnesses an old woman enter and beg Mary to deliver from purgatory the soul of the Prefect of Rome, who had given her a coat on a cold Christmas day. Her request is granted. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 21; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 18^v; *Ma*, fol. 20; *Rc*, fol. 24; *Rv*^{3}, no. 143, fol. 76; *Fp*^{2}, the tale begins on fol. 27^v, and ends on fol. 29^v, fol. 28 being cut out (identification is possible despite the mutilation); *Fr*^{5}, fol. 132; *Fr*^{6}, fol. 78.

23. Nun's Penance Left Uncompleted.[46] A nun dies before she can perform complete penance for past sin. She appears to her abbess and tells her that she is still expiating in purgatory, but that the Virgin has promised to obtain her release soon. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 22^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 19^v; omitted in both *Ma* and *Rc*; *Rv*^{3}, no. 144, fol. 77^v;*Fp*^{2}, fol. 29^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 133.

24. Two Brothers at Rome.[47] One brother, Peter, thought to be saintly, is sent to purgatory for avarice; the other, Stephen, is condemned for robbing the churches of Sts. Lawrence and Agnes. Stephen finds an intercessor in St. Prix (Proiecto) who pleads with Mary. He is restored to life for thirty days of penance. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 23^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 20; *Ma*, fol. 21; *Rc*, fol. 26; *Rv*^{3}, no. 145, fol. 78^v; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 31^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 133^v.

25. Nativity of the Virgin.[48] For many years on the night of the eighth of September a hermit is wont to hear angel-music. At length it is revealed to him by an angel that it is the angelic celebration of Mary's Nativity. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 26; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 21^v; *Ma*, fol. 22; *Rc*, fol. 27; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 32^v; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 134^v.

26. Octave of the Nativity.[49] This is the story of the institution of the Octave of the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin by Innocent IV (1245), in accordance with a vow made by the Cardinals who were kept prisoners by Frederick II for three months. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 26^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 21^v; *Ma*, fol. 22; *Rc*, fol. 27^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 33; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 135.

27. Image of Sardinay.[50] A monk on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land visits a recluse and promises to bring her back a picture of Our Lady. Forgetting his promise, he is reminded by a voice from heaven. On his return trip his life is saved three times through invocation of the Virgin and he resolves to keep the image. He leaves the money given him by the hermitess on an altar in her oratory, but cannot find the exit until he leaves the picture there. An oil of miraculous virtue exudes from the image. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 26^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 22; *Ma*, fol. 22^v;

---

[43] Only a fragment of the legend is given in *Ma*. A part of fol. 17^r, fols. 17^v, 18^{r-v} are lined but blank. The end of the tale on fols. 19 and 20 is in another hand.

[44] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 38 and 108.

[45] Peter Damian, *Opusc. XXXIV: Disputatio de variis apparitionibus et miraculis*, 4; PL, 145, 587-8. Aloys Meister (ed.), *Die Fragmente der* Libri VIII miraculorum *des Caesarius von Heisterbach* (Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Alterthumskunde und für Kirchengeschiche, Supplementheft, 13. Rome, 1901). iii, no. 42, pp. 170-3; A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III. no. 62, 181-3; Mussafia, *Studien*, V, no. 62, 10.

[46] Mussafia, *Studien*, V, 59-64. Cf. Pez, no. 42, pp. 105-6; Introduction to Miélot, no. xviii; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 41, p. 57.

[47] Gregory the Great relates the vision of a knight who sees Peter in torment and Stephen crossing the Bridge of Dread, cf. *Dialogi*, IV, 37; ed. Umberto Moricca (Fonti per la Storia d'Italia, Rome, 1924), pp. 286 ff. Cf. Pez, no. 10, p. 86; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 46, p. 197; *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 73.

[48] The legend occurs three times in the works of Honorius of Autun who wrote between 1122 and 1137: *Gemma animae* III, 166, *Sacramentarium*, 45, and *Speculum ecclesiae*; PL, 172, 689, 769, 1001. The source is doubtlessly the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, p. 590, where both this and the following story of the establishment of the octave of the feast are found together. For variants cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 15, pp. 170-1. See also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 46, pp. 122-4; *infra*, Groups II, 21 and III, 46.

[49] *Legenda aurea*, *ibid.* Cf. *infra*, Group V, *Fp*^{1}, no. 6.

[50] Cf. Gaston Raynaud, 'Le miracle de Sardenai,' *Romania*, XI (1882), 519-37 and XIV (1885), 82-93; *RR*, II, no. 21, 263-4.

Rc, fol. 28; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 33^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 135.

28. PILGRIM OF ST. JAMES.[51] Girardus visits his mistress the night before starting on a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. James at Compostella. The devil in the form of the saint intercepts him on his journey and persuades him to kill himself. He is restored to life by the judgment of the Virgin. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 27^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 23; *Ma*, fol. 23^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 29^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[52] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 35^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 136.

29. VIRGIN COMES TO DEVIL INSTEAD OF HIS VICTIM.[53] An impoverished knight promises to bring his wife to the devil in return for wealth. On the way the wife stops to pray at a chapel. The Virgin impersonates her and accompanies the knight, putting the devil to flight. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 28^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 24; *Ma*, fol. 24^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 31; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[54] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 37; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 136^{v}.

30. MONKS BY THE RIVERSIDE.[55] Standing by the riverside, engaged in idle talk, monks see devils conveying the soul of Ebroin, Mayor of the Palace, to hell and are told that they would have been carried off, too, were it not for their prayer to the Virgin. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 30; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 25^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 25^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 32^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[56] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 39^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 137^{v}.

31. FIVE JOYS.[57] The Virgin visits a dying clerk, promising him a share in the joy he has so often wished her in singing the anthem, *Five Gaudes*. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 30^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, rubrics only on fol. 25^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 26; *Rc*, fol. 33; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[58] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 39^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 137^{v}.

32. VISION OF JUDGMENT.[59] A sinner dreams that he is being judged. Truth and Justice acquit him of two accusations of the devil who would have claimed him when his good and evil deeds were being weighed in a balance, had not the Virgin put her hand in the scale. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 31^{r-v} is blank, a portion of the legend being given on fols. 32-33 inclusive; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 26 is blank, the last part of the tale being given on fol. 27^{r-v}; *Ma*, fol. 26; *Rc*, fol. 33^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, no. 146, fol. 79; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 40^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 138.

33. THE VIRGIN'S CHOIR. A bishop[60] is led by Mary into her chapel one night,

---

[51] Originally the miracle was ascribed to St. James, see Hugh of St. Victor, *Liber de sacramentis* II, 2; PL, 176, 583. In the metrical version of Guaiferius, Benedictine of Monte Cassino, St. James is the principal protagonist and the Virgin plays a secondary role, *Carmina*, no. ii; PL, 147, 1285-8. Guibert of Nogent, writing his *Monodiarum* or *De Vita sua* about 1114 or 1115, gives it the form that has survived in Marian collections, III, 19; PL, 156, 955-6. In the spurious works of St. Anselm are two versions: one makes no mention of Mary; PL, 159, 335-8: the other depicts her restoring Giraldus to life, *ibid.*, 340). Cf. Pez, no. 8, p. 85; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 50, pp. 199-200; R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 8, p. 65.

[52] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 66.

[53] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 119; *ed. cit.*, p. 513 (3). This, one of the most popular legends in the Italian collections, is the first in the *Libro del Cavaliere* (cf. *infra*, Groups II and III, 1). See also 'Le Dit du povre chevalier,' A. Jubinal, *Nouveau recueil de contes, dits, fabliaux et autres pièces inédites* I (Paris, 1839), 138-44; Alfonso el Sabio, *Cantigas de Santa Maria* II, ed. by La Real Academia Española (Madrid, 1889), 302-3, no. 216 with variants listed on p. lxxxvi. Add to the bibliographical references of A. Hilka (*op. cit.*, III, 210-11, no. 96), L. Biadene, 'Un miracolo della Madonna: La leggenda dello Sclavo Dalmasina,' *Propugnatore*, N. S. VI, ii (1893), 319-72: P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 1, pp. 3-6; *infra*, Group V, *Fp*^{3}, no. 1, and *Fr*^{10}, no. 71.

[54] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 113.

[55] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 119; *ed. cit.*, p. 516 (6); Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, II, 354-5 and xxviii, no 254. For variants cf. *Liber exemplorum ad usum praedicantium*, ed. A. G. Little (Aberdeen, 1908), no. 535, p. 150. Cf. *infra*, Group V, *Fp*^{1}, no. 3, and *Fr*^{10}, no. 130.

[56] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 102.

[57] Cf. Peter Damian, *Opusc. XXXIV: Disputatio de variis apparitionibus*, 4; PL, 145, 588. Add to the variants listed by Crane in Pez, (no. 4, pp. 83-4), R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 4, p. 62; *infra*, Groups II, 9 and IV, 35 and 96. Cf. 'Seven Joys' in P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 8, pp. 19-20; *infra*, Group III, 8.

[58] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 35 and 96.

[59] No. 32 corresponds to the version found in the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 119; *ed. cit.*, pp. 514-5 (4). For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 212, n. 97. See also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 63, pp. 166-71; *infra*, Groups III, 63 and V, *Fp*^{1}, no. 1.

[60] The bishop is not named as in the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, p. 591 (3). In Pez and in other collections the bishop is said to be St. Dunstan. See the *Vita S. Dunstani* by the four biographers, 'B,' Osbern, Eadmer, and William of Malmesbury in *Memorials of Saint Dunstan*, ed. Wm. Stubbs (Rolls Series, LXIII, London, 1874), pp. 48, 118, 208, and 316. For the hymn of Sedulius cf. PL, 19, 753. For the variants cf. Pez, no. 25, pp. 92-3: see also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 64, pp. 171-3; *infra*, Groups III, 64 and V, *Fp*^{1}, no. 8.

and there he hears her choir of virgins sing the hymn: *Cantemus domino socie cantemus honorem.* *FLa*^{2}, fol. 33; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 27^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 27; *Rc*, fol. 35; *Rv*^{3}, no. 147, fol. 80; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 42; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 138.

34. Christ-Child Seized as Pledge.[61] A widow prays before a statue of the Madonna and Child for the release of her son made captive by enemies. When her prayers are not heard, she snatches the figure of the Infant Jesus from the arms of Mary to keep in pledge. That night the Virgin releases the son from prison, bidding him tell his mother to restore her Child. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 33^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 28; *Ma*, fol. 27^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 35^{v};[62] *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[63] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 43^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 139; *Fr*^{6}, fols. 81^{v}-82^{v}.

35. Taper Left Behind by an Angel.[64] A rich countess has erected a chapel dedicated to Mary and is most disappointed not to have Mass there on the Feast of the Purification. Suddenly she finds herself attending a Mass at which the entire Heavenly Court assists. At the Virgin's command she is given a taper like the rest, but at the Offertory refuses to give it up. She struggles with the angel and awakens to find a fragment in her hand. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 34; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 28^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 28; *Rc*, fol. 36; *Rv*^{3}, no. 148, fol. 80; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 44^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 139^{v}.

36. Devil as Servant.[65] A robber-knight is served for fourteen years by an evil spirit in human form who is on the watch to kill him, but cannot do so as the knight never omits his practice of a daily prayer to the Virgin. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 35^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 30; *Ma*, fol. 29^{v}, fols. 30, 31, 32 are blank, and the end of the tale in two different hands follows on fol. 33; *Rc*, fol. 38; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[66] *Fp*^{2}, fol. 45^{v}; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 140.

37. Toledo.[67] In the Cathedral of Toledo, on the Feast of the Assumption, Mary is heard to complain that the Jews are still insulting her Son. Jews are found mutilating a waxen image of Christ and are put to death. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 36^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 30^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 33^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 39; *Rv*^{3}, no. 149, fol. 81^{v}; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 47; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 141.

38. Hours of the Virgin.[68] Although not according to their rule, monks at the Monastery of 'San Vinciencio' daily recite the Hours of the Blessed Virgin. Following the suggestion of a negligent monk, Goçço, they abolish the custom, but calamities visit the monastery until the devotion is resumed. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 37; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 31; *Ma*, fol. 34; *Rc*, fol. 39^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, no. 150, fol. 82^{v}; *Fp*^{2}, fol. 48; *Fr*^{5}, fol. 141.

---

[61] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, pp. 591-592 (4). For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 216, n. 102; J. Morawski, *op. cit.*, pp. 200-1; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 18, pp. 45-6. In Italian the tale is found in Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 20, pp. 42-3; J. Ulrich, 'Recueil d'exemples en ancien italien,' *Romania*, XIII (1884), no. 6, 30-1; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no 47, pp. 124-6; *infra*, Groups III, 47; IV, *Fn*^{4}, no. 102; V, *Fp*^{1}, no. 5, *Fr*^{13}, *Fl*, *Fr*^{10}, nos. 43 and 48.

[62] The copyist wrongly gives the rubrics for 'Vision of Judgment' (cf. *supra*, no. 32) to this legend.

[63] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, nos. 105, 114 and the curious variant, no. 116.

[64] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, ed. J. Strange in 2 vols. (Cologne, 1851), VII, 20, ii, 26-7 and A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 28, pp. 157-8; Fidel Fita, 'Treinta leyendas por Gil de Zamora,' *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XIII (1888), no. 63, 200-2; *Legenda aurea*, cap. 37; *ed. cit.*, pp. 165-6 (2). For other variants A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 169, n. 48; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 34, p. 53. See also P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 19, pp. 56-7; *infra*, Groups III, 19; IV, *Fn*^{4}, no. 101; V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 1.

[65] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 51; *ed. cit.*, pp. 221-222 (3). Many of the Latin collections contain this version; cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 190, n. 73 and 213, n. 98; *RR*, II, no. 26, 270; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 55, p. 284. It is first among the five Mary legends in Bonavesin da Riva, *Laudes de Virgine Maria*, ed. I. Bekker in the *Bericht über die zur Bekanntmachung geeigneten Verhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1850), pp. 481-91, ll. 101-192. See also Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 39, p. cxlii; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 2, pp. 6-8; *infra*, Groups II, and III, no. 2; V, *Fr*^{1}, no. 5, and *Fr*^{10}, no. 51. For a slightly different version cf. *infra*, Group I, *Ma* 78-*Rc* 73.

[66] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 63.

[67] 'Toledo' is the first legend in the *TS* group. Cf. C. Neuhaus (ed)., *Die lateinischen Vorlagen zu den alt-französischen Adgar'schen Marienlegenden* (Aschersleben, 1886-1887), pp. 51-2; or *Die Quellen zu Adgar's Marienlegenden nach der Londoner Handschrift Egerton 612* (Erlangen, 1882), pp. 29-32; R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 19, p. 73. Cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 9, p. 166.

[68] This Benedictine monastery is located near Pietrapertusa, Italy. Peter Damian relates the same story of the monastery of St. Barnabas of Gamagno about the year 1056 in his *Epist.* VI, 32; PL, 144, 431.

39. BLASPHEMING MERCHANT.[69] An avaricious merchant swears by the breasts of Mary and falls dead. FLa^2, fol. 38; Fr^3, fol. 32; *Ma*, fol. 35; *Rc*, fol. 40; Rv^3, no. 151, fol. 83; Fp^2, fol. 49^v; Fr^5, fol. 142.

40. ST. JOHN THE ALMONER.[70] During a time of famine St. John, Patriarch of Alexandria (606-616), sells all his household furnishings and bedding in order to buy food for the poor. A merchant procures for him new bedding, but this, too. is given away. Repeating this forty-four times, the merchant is finally impoverished. One night when the saint is lamenting that he has nothing more to give, the Virgin appears and after receiving a scolding for coming into his apartments, smilingly tells him that God is pleased with his almsgiving and will supply his needs. The next day on his way to celebrate Mass, he is given a purse filled with gold by an angel and during the Mass the identity of his feminine visitor is revealed. FLa^2, fol. 38^v; Fr^3, fol. 32^v; *Ma*, fol. 35; *Rc*, fol. 41; Rv^3, no. 152, fol. 83. At this point the correspondence between Group I and Fp^2 and Fr^5 ceases.[71]

41. ST. ELIZABETH'S VISION OF THE ASSUMPTION.[72] St. Elizabeth prays to have a fuller knowledge of the mystery of Mary's Assumption into heaven. On this feast day at the Consecration of the Mass she is permitted to witness what occurred. FLa^2, fol. 40^v; Fr^3, fol. 34^v; *Ma*, fol. 37; *Rc*, fol. 43^v; Rv^3, no. 153, fol. 84^v.

42. SIEGE OF CHARTRES.[73] After the Assumption the clothing of Mary is found in the tomb. Her tunic comes into the possession of the church at Chartres and is displayed as a banner by the bishop during the siege of the city. The foe, Rollo and his band of Normands, are struck by blindness. FLa^2, fol. 41^v; Fr^3, fol. 35; *Ma*, fol. 38; *Rc*, fol. 44^v; Rv^3, omitted.[74]

43. THEOPHILUS.[75] In this version Theophilus is the archdeacon of the Church

---

[69] Etienne de Bourbon, *op. cit.*, no. 131, p. 112; Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, VII, 104. Cf. *RR*, II, no. 22, 265-6; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 51, pp. 282-3.

[70] See *Vitae patrum* in which John believes the woman to be 'Eleemosyna'; PL, 73, 345-55; Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, XXII, 108; *Legenda aurea*, cap. 27; *ed. cit.*, pp. 130-31; *Magnum speculum exemplorum*, ed. John Major (Venice, 1608), vii, no. 30, p. 498. An Old French version in *Ms* R.3.46 of Trinity College has been printed by Paul Meyer, 'Notice d'un manuscript de Trinity College (Cambridge) contenant les Vies en vers français de Saint Jean l'Aumônier et de Saint Clément, Pope,' *Notices et extraits des mss. de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXXVIII, 1 (1903), 14. The version of Alfonso el Sabio differs, cf. *op. cit.*, II, 215-6, no. 145.

[71] The two legends remaining in Fp^2 and the seven in Fr^5 which do not correspond to the *Libro del Naufragio* series will be analyzed among the miscellaneous legends of Group V; cf. *infra*, Group V, Fp^2 and Fr^5.

[72] No. 41 corresponds to the account in the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 119; *ed. cit.*, p. 510. Cf. P. Livarius Oliger O.F.M., 'Revelationes B. Elisabeth Disquisitio critica una cum textibus latino et catalaunensi,' *Antonianum*, I (1926), 24-83; F. W. E. Roth, *Die Visionen und Briefe der hl. Elisabeth* (2nd ed. Brunn, 1886); D. M. Manni, *Vite di alcuni Santi scritte nel buon secolo della lingua toscana* (Florence, 1752), pp. 358-70; Paul Meyer, 'Notice sur un légendier français du xiii siècle classé selon l'ordre de l'année liturgique,' *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, XXXVI (1899), 46 (114). It is significant that the manuscripts in Group I attribute the revelations concerning the Assumption to Elizabeth, *figluola del Re d'Ungheria* (the copyist of Fr^3 has St. Elizabeth *d'Inghilterra*). For attribution both to St. Elizabeth of Hungary and St. Elizabeth of Shönau, cf. P. Oliger, *loc. cit.* Legend 41 in Group I serves to introduce legend 42, 'Siege of Chartres'; Evelyn Faye Wilson notes that the visions of Elizabeth of Shönau are introductory to the Mary legends in the three collections of Vincent of Beauvais, Vendôme, and *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. *fr.* 818; cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 37, 44, n. 218 and 49.

[73] William of Malmesbury briefly relates the incident, *Gesta regum anglorum* I, ed. Wm. Stubbs (Rolls Series, XC, London, 1887-1889), pp. 137-8. See Wace, *Roman de Rou et des ducs de Normandie* I, ed. Hugo Andresen (Heilbronn, 1877-1879), 68-71. For the Latin version of Gilon of Chartres in the local collection of Chartres, cf. A. Thomas, 'Les miracles de Notre-Dame de Chartres,' *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes*, XLII (1881) no. 27, 549-50; for the translation into Old French, cf. Jehan le Marchant, *Miracles de Nostre-Dame de Chartres*, ed. G. Gratet-Duplessis (Chartres, 1855), no. 28, pp. 179-84. For variants cf. *RR*. II, no. 5, 245; E. F. Wilson who briefly but thoroughly traces the historical and miraculous aspects of the legend, *op. cit.*, no. 32, pp. 186-7; *infra*, Group II, 22.

[74] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 74.

[75] The legend derives from the Greek text of Eutychianus, cf. A. Jubinal, *Oeuvres complètes de Rutebeuf* II (Paris, 1839), pp. 331-357. For the earliest Latin translation, that of Paul the Deacon of Naples, cf. Robert

of Tarsus in 'Cicilia.' Through humility he refuses to become bishop and later, when deposed from his office, he signs a compact with the devil to regain his former honors. Repenting, he obtains forgiveness and recovers possession of the signed pact through the assistance of Mary. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 42; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 35^v; *Ma*, the tale begins on fol. 38^v and ends in a different hand on fol. 41^v, but fol. 40^v is blank; *Rc*, fol. 45; *Rv*^{3}, no. 154, fol. 85^v.

44. St. John Damascene.[76] During his captivity by the Saracens St. John teaches handwriting to the son of one of his masters. Years later, by the command of Emperor Theodosius, he is released, but in consequence of a letter forged by his former pupil, he is accused of treason and his hand cut off. It is miraculously restored by the Virgin. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 45; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 38; *Ma*, fol. 41^v; *Rc*, fol. 48^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 155, fol. 88.

45. Disobedient Son.[77] In the diocese of Toulouse in September of 1256 the mistress of the castle of 'Settiforni' commends her son to the evil spirit because of his disobedience and ill temper. That night devils are about to carry him off through the chimney when the boy invokes the Virgin. The devils release him, letting him fall upon the ashes below. He remains dwarfed in stature for the rest of his life. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 48; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 40^v; *Ma*, fol. 44; *Rc*, fol. 51; *Rv*^{3}, no. 156, fol. 90.

46. Foundation of Dominican Order.[78] Pope Innocent sends twelve Cistercian abbots on an embassy of peace to the Albigensians. One of them witnesses a man raised from the dead. The resuscitated man tells of seeing Mary on her knees, pleading with her Son to send an Order to save men and of having her prayer granted. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 48^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 41; *Ma*, fol. 44^v; *Rc*, fol. 52; *Rv*^{3}, no. 157, fol. 90^v.

47. Julian the Apostate.[79] In his campaign against the Persians the Emperor Julian stops at Caesarea and insults St. Basil, threatening to destroy the city on his return. The archbishop prays to the Mother of God and at her command Julian is killed by St. Mercurius. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 50; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 42; *Ma*, fol. 45; *Rc*, fol. 53; *Rv*^{3}, no. 158, fol. 91^v.

48. Brother of the King of Hungary.[80] The brother of the King of Hungary

---

Petsch, *Theophilus* (Heidelberg, 1908), pp. 2 ff. For bibliographical references cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 60, pp. 208-9. To her list of variants in Latin collections may be added R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 28, pp. 80 ff.; to the Italian list, P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 36, pp. 93-103; W. Friedmann, *Altitalienische Heiligenlegenden nach der Hs. XXXVIII. 110 der Bib. Naz. Centrale in Florenz* (Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur, XIV, Dresden, 1908), pp. 36-7; *infra*, Group III, 36 and V, *Fn*^{5}, no. 10, *Fp*^{1}, no. 13 and *Fr*^{10}, no. 35. For the dramatic version cf. Alessandro d'Ancona, *Sacre rappresentazioni dei secoli XIV, XV, et XVI* II (Florence, 1872), pp. 445-67.

[76] The story in the life of St. John Damascene is told by John of Jerusalem (PG, 94, 453-6). Vincent of Beauvais includes the legend in the *Speculum historiale*, XVII, 103-5; H. Kjellman notes that the tales in *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. *fr.* 818 and in the *Speculum historiale* are identical in details which differ from the biography of John of Jerusalem; he concludes: l'auteur français et Vincent de Beauvais ont connu le même récit latin. Cf. 'La légende de Saint Jean Damascene,' *Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap*, VIII (1921), 103-20. For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 177, n. 58; *RR*, II, no. 23, 267-8; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 10, pp. 268-9. Add to references P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 65, pp. 174-83; *infra*, Groups III, 65, and V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 53.

[77] The legend is substantially the same as no. 24 in *Ms* Cornell B. 14 of which Crane writes: I have not found any other version of this miracle, cf. *RR*, II, 268-9. Here the tale is localized at Toledo, Spain. Research librarians in the archives of the cathedrals and of the libraries in Toulouse and Toledo have been unable to identify the castle of 'Settiforni.'

[78] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 113; *ed. cit.*, p. 469. This pope was probably Innocent III (1198-1216), cf. *infra*, n. 110.

[79] The legend is contained in the *Vita S. Basilii*, falsely attributed to Amphilochius (d. *ca.* 400). See Otto Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* III, (Freiburg, 1912), p. 130, n. 1 and p. 227. The attribution of the first Latin version to Ursus who lived in the ninth century is likewise questioned. See *Vita Sancti Basilii*; PL, 73, 312-3, n. 3; *Acta SS.*, *14 June*, p. 417; John of Salisbury, *Polycraticus*, VIII, 21; PL, 199, 798. Variants are indicated by E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 24, pp. 181-2 and to these may be added Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 56, p. 62; W. Friedmann, *op. cit.*, no. 11, pp. 37-40; *infra*, Group V, *Fn*^{5}, no. 11; V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 90.

[80] See the spurious works of Anselm, *Sermo de Conceptione Beatae Mariae*; PL, 159 320-1; *Legenda aurea*, cap. 189; *ed. cit.*, p. 870. For

has vowed to remain chaste in consequence of a cure through the Virgin's intercession. At the death of the King he is forced to accept the throne and to marry. After the nuptial Mass he remains to recite the Hours of the Blessed Virgin. Mary appears to him and upbraids him for breaking his vow. At the first opportunity he slips away, and later he becomes Patriarch of Aquileia. FLa^2, fol. 52^v; Fr^3, fol. 44^v; *Ma*, fol. 48; *Rc*, fol. 55; Rv^3, no. 159, fol. 93^v.

49. DEMONS AS SWINE.[81] The Virgin delivers a Carthusian Brother from devils in the form of swine. FLa^2, fol. 53^v; Fr^3, fol. 45; *Ma*, fol. 49; *Rc*, fol. 57; Rv^3, no. 160, fol. 94^v.

50. LANDMARKS REMOVED.[82] A peasant who has been dishonest in acquiring land dies. Devils and angels dispute over his soul, but because of his devotion to the Mother of God, the evil spirits are forced to retire and he is permitted to return to life to do penance. FLa^2, fol. 54^v; Fr^3, fol. 46; *Ma*, fol. 49^v; *Rc*, fol. 58^v; Rv^3, no. 161, fol. 95.

51. SIGHT RESTORED.[83] In Rome at the time of Pope Boniface IV (607-614), Victor, a Christian, blind from birth, is wont to sing anthems to Mary outside the Pantheon, then the Church of St. Mary and the Martyrs. He is taunted by the Jews, who promise to become Christians if the Mother of God will obtain for him his sight. On the Feast of the Purification as he is chanting a *responsorium* of his own composition, the miracle occurs and many Jews are converted. FLa^2, fol. 54^v; Fr^3, fol. 46^v; *Ma*, fol. 49^v; *Rc*, fol. 58^v; Rv^3, no. 162, fol. 95^v.

52. DROWNED CLERK.[84] A clerk of dissolute life drowns and the devils claim his soul. He is saved by Mary, who interposes because of his frequent calling upon her to obtain for him the strength to overcome his temptations. FLa^2, fol. 55^v; Fr^3, fol. 47; omitted in *Ma*, *Rc*, and Rv^3.

53. LITANY CHANTED. In Lombardy two brothers who are at feud with another family find themselves unarmed in the presence of the enemy. They begin to chant the Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as they ride towards their armed foe, who remain paralyzed, unable to strike a blow, until the brothers are beyond their reach. FLa^2, fol. 57; Fr^3, fol. 48^v; *Ma*, fol. 50^v; *Rc*, fol. 59^v; Rv^3, no. 163, fol. 96.

54. MOTHER-IN-LAW AND SON-IN-LAW.[85] A woman, suspected unjustly of incest with her son-in-law, becomes temporarily unbalanced and has him murdered. She repents of her deed, but is accused and condemned to be burned. She prays to Mary and is unharmed by the fire. FLa^2, fol. 57^v; Fr^3, fol. 49; *Ma*, fol. 50^v; *Rc*, fol. 60; Rv^3, omitted.[86]

55. COULD LEARN ONLY *Ave Maria*.[87] An illiterate knight becomes a Cistercian,

---

variants cf. *RR*, II, no. 20, 263; Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 40, pp. cxlii ff.; E. F. Wilson, *op cit.*, pp. 162-3; *infra*, Group V, Fp^3, no. 21.

[81] Peter the Venerable relates the legend, *De Miraculis* II, 29; PL, 189, 946, and later it is told by Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, VII, 112. Cf. *RR*, II, no. 13, 255; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 63.

[82] Cf. Pez, no. 11, p. 87; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 47, pp. 197-8; R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 11, p. 67; *infra*, Groups IV, 21 and IV, Fn^4, no. 60.

[83] The blind man is usually called Didymus, the blind philosopher of Alexandria, cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 649. Mussafia indicates a version in which he is called Victor, cf. *Studien* I, no. 54, 965. For variants cf. *RR*, II, no. 16, 257-8; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 31, pp. 185-6.

[84] Cf. *supra*, Group I, nos. 10 and 18.

[85] The mother-in-law is called Theodeberta by Guibert of Nogent, in his *De Laude S. Mariae*, 10; PL, 156, 564-8) but Soiburga by Herman of Tournai, author of the Laon collection, *De Miraculis S. Mariae Laudunensis* III, 27; PL, 156, 1008. See also the *Auctarium Laudunense* and the *Auctarium Ursicampinum*, attached to the Chronicle of Sigebert of Gembloux; PL, 160, 359, 405; Helinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon;* PL, 212, 1017. Our version corresponds to the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, pp. 594-5. Cf. J. Morawski, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-2; Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, II, 355-8, no. 255 with variants on pp. lxiv-lxv; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 4, pp. 10-2; *infra*, Groups II, and III, no. 4; V, Fr^{10}, no. 32.

[86] Cf. *infra*, Rv^3, no. 93, in Group II, 4.

[87] See A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 71, pp. 195-6 or A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, no. 91, 206; *Legenda aurea*, cap. 51; *ed. cit.*, p. 221; see also Thomas of Cantimpré who composed his moral treatise, the *Bonum universale de apibus* II, 29, 9 (Cologne, *ca.* 1473) between the years 1270-1272. In his version a tree issues from the monk's mouth. Bonavesin da Riva includes the legend in his *Laudes de Virgine Maria*, *loc. cit.*, ll. 473-528, pp. 490-1. For other variants, cf. *RR*, II, no. 25, 270;

but can learn none of the prayers except the two words, *Ave Maria.* After his death a lily grows on his grave, having these words on its leaves in letters of gold and its roots in the mouth of the monk. FLa^2, fol. 58^v; Fr^3, fol. 50; *Ma*, fol. 52; *Rc*, fol. 62; Rv^3, no. 164, fol. 96.

56. EUCHARISTIC MIRACLE.[88] At the Consecration of the Mass a priest suddenly beholds the Host changed into the form of a small child in Mary's arms, and an angel proclaims Him to be Lord of heaven and earth. FLa^2, fol. 59; Fr^3, fol. 50^v; *Ma*, fol. 52; *Rc*, fol. 62^v; Rv^3, omitted.[89]

57. JEWISH BOY.[90] On an Easter morning a little Jewish boy slips in with his companions to receive Communion. He relates this to his parents, and his father in much anger throws him into a red-hot furnace. The neighbors are attracted by the mother's cries and find the child unhurt, having been protected by the Virgin whose picture hung over the main altar in the church at Bourges. The father is cast into the furnace and the mother with many other Jews becomes Christian. FLa^2, fol. 59^v; Fr^3, fol. 50^v; *Ma*, fol. 52^v; *Rc*, fol. 62^v; Rv^3, omitted.[91]

58. PRAYER PUTS DEVIL TO FLIGHT.[92] A woman, molested by the devil in the form of a youth, is advised by a holy man to say: 'Santa Maria, aiutami.' She does so and the devil vanishes, cursing the one who taught her this. FLa^2, fol. 60^v; Fr^3, fol. 51^v; *Ma*, fol. 53; *Rc*, fol. 64; Rv^3, no. 165, fol. 96^v.

59. PLOUGHING ON THE MAGDALEN'S DAY.[93] Peter, a ploughman, works on the Feast of St. Mary Magdalen and is punished by the loss of his property and of his leg. The leg is restored by the Virgin and St. Hippolytus. Later Peter becomes a hermit and is freed from the devil in the form of a woman when he throws a stole over her and finds only a corpse. FLa^2, fol. 61; Fr^3, fol. 52; *Ma*, fol. 53^v; *Rc*, fol. 64^v; Rv^3, no. 166, fol. 97.

60. THIEF SUSTAINED.[94] A thief, who is usually named Ebbo, but unnamed in this version, is sustained for three days on the gallows by the Virgin. He later becomes a monk. FLa^2, fol. 62; Fr^3, fol. 53^v; *Ma*, fol. 55^v; *Rc*, fol. 66^v; Rv^3, omitted[95].

61. MARY AND BRIDEGROOM.[96] The writer goes to great pains to explain that the clerk in this legend is under minor Orders and being free to marry, becomes betrothed. After the apparition of Mary, who upbraids him for giving up the

---

Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 28, p. 275; Miélot, no. vii. Add to these references P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 3, pp. 9-10 and no. 37, pp. 104-5, *infra*, Groups II, 3; III, 3 and 37*B*; V, Fr^{10}, no. 24.

[88] This is the version of Peter the Venerable, *De Miraculis* I, 8; PL. 189, 866, where the priest is Gerard of Cluny, cf. *infra*, Group III, 25.

[89] Rv^3 has a slightly different version, cf. *infra*, Group IV, 54.

[90] Cf. Eugen Wolter, *Der Judenknabe* (Bibliotheca Normannica, II, Halle, 1879); Theodor Pelizaeus, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Legende vom Judenknaben* (Halle, 1914). J. Ulrich has printed an Old Italian version from *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 22557, cf. *op. cit.*, no. 52, pp. 54-5. Lists of variants may be found in Pez, no. 31, p. 97; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 13, pp. 43-4; more to be recommended, E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 3, pp. 157-9. Cf. *infra*, Groups IV, Fn^4, no. 103; V, Fp^1, no. 2, Fr^9, no. 1 and Fr^{10}, nos. 30 and 135.

[91] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 120.

[92] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 119; *ed. cit.*, p. 517 (8); an interesting variant may be found in the *Dialogus miraculorum* of Caesarius of Heisterbach, VII, 27, ii, 37. Cf. Villecourt, no. 17, p. 271; J. Morawski in *Romania*, LXI (1935), 324.

[93] The legend is first told by Guibert of Nogent, *De Laude S. Mariae*, 11; PL, 156, 570. See also H. Isnard, 'Recueil des miracles de la Vierge du XIII^e siècle,' *Bulletin de la Société arch . . . du Vendomois*, XXVI (1887), 206-10; F. Fita, *op. cit.*, no. 68, pp. 207-13; Introduction to Jean Miélot, no. xli; J. Morawski in *Romania*, LXIV (1938), 458-60. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 62.

[94] No. 60 is found in most mediaeval collections, cf. Pez, no. 6, p. 84; *RR*, II, no. 11, 252-3; Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 19, p. cxxxi; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 61, pp. 209-10. Add to their references R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 6, p. 63; *infra*, Group V, Fp^1, no. 8, Fp^3, nos. 2 and 24, Fr^{10}, nos. 35, 49, and 125.

[95] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 33 and 61.

[96] The details correspond to the sixteenth legend of the *HM* series, cf. Pez, 'Clerk of Pisa,' pp. 18-9 with notes on p. 89. Evelyn Faye Wilson presents the six versions of the 'Bridegroom' tale with bibliographical indications for each type, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-6. See also Anna Wyrembek and Jozef Morawski, *Les légendes du 'Fiancé de la Vierge,'* (*Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciól Nauk. Prace Komisji Filologicznej*, vii, 3, Poznań, 1934). Cf. *supra*, no. 48; *infra*, Group V, Fp^1, no. 10, Fr^9, no. 3 and Fr^{10}, no. 29.

higher life of chastity, he leaves his fiancée and enters religion. FLa^2, fol. 63; Fr^3, fol. 54; Ma, fol. 55^v; Rc, fol. 67^v; Rv^3, no. 167, fol. 98^v.

62. VISION OF JUDGEMENT.[97] A clerk, living a dissolute life, is brought to a virtuous one by a dream in which he has a vision of judgement and is saved only because the Virgin intercedes for him. FLa^2, fol. 63^v; Fr^3, fol. 54^v; omitted in Ma and Rc; Rv^3, no. 168, fol. 99.

63. THE PRIEST OF ONE MASS.[98] A saintly priest is suspended by the bishop because he knows only the Mass of the Blessed Virgin with the introit: *Salve sancta parens.* He has recourse to Mary, who appears to the bishop, threatening him with death if he does not reinstate the priest. FLa^2, fol. 64^v; Fr^3, fol. 55^v; Ma, fol. 56; Rc, fol. 69; Rv^3, no. 169, fol. 100.

64. SIEGE OF CONSTANTINOPLE.[99] During the reign of the Emperor Theodosius, the Saracens under 'Musilimo' besiege Constantinople. Because of the prayers of the citizens, they are powerless and their leader sees the city shielded by the mantle of the Virgin, who descends each day from heaven with her host of angels. He with a thousand of his men asks to venerate her image in the Basilica and then withdraws. FLa^2, fol. 65; Fr^3, fol. 56; Ma, fol. 57; Rc, fol. 70; Rv^3, no. 170, fol. 100^v.

65. DELIVERED FROM PURGATORY.[100] A Roman matron, Maria Mariozza, receives the Sacraments of the Dying but fails to confess her frequent sins of vanity. A year after her death she is seen on the Feast of the Assumption by her godmother to whom she reveals that she has been delivered from purgatory through the intercession of Mary, and that on this feast day the number of souls liberated exceeds the population of Rome. As a proof of her veracity she foretells the death of the godmother within a year. The godmother dies on the vigil of the Feast the following year. FLa^2, fol. 66^v; Fr^3, fol. 57; Ma, fol. 58; Rc, fol. 72; Rv^3, no. 171, fol. 101^v.

66. OFFICE OF THE DEAD.[101] A monk who is negligent in saying his regular Office, but daily recites the Office of the Dead, dies. The dead for whom he has prayed become his advocates with Mary who pleads with her Son, obtaining a short purgatorial sentence. FLa^2, fol. 67^v; Fr^3, fol. 58^v; Ma, fol. 59; Rc, fol. 74^v; Rv^3, no. 172, fol. 102^v.

67. MONK REVIVED FOR CONFESSION.[102] A monk in Burgundy named Bassus, upon returning from a pilgrimage, stops at a monastery where he dies suddenly and without the sacraments. While the monks are praying over his body, he revives and tells them how at his death two angels came to receive his soul, but that the evil spirits had contested their rights on the ground of justice. Mary

---

[97] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, p. 593 (8); F. Fita, *op. cit.*, no. 59, p. 196. The details also agree with the version in *Ms Arundel* 406 (fol. 24) of the British Museum, described by Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 663 (11).

[98] *Legenda aurea, loc. cit.* (7). Many scholars consider the version in Peter Damian, *Opusc. XXXIII: de bono suffragiorum*, 3; PL, 145, 564, the source of this legend. Peter Damian's story of an inept clerk removed by his bishop and of the Virgin's ordering that the prelate be beaten with a rod is the subject of another legend in Group I of this study, cf. *infra*, no. 68. For variants of 'The Priest of One Mass' cf. Pez, no. 9, p. 86; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 25, p. 182. In addition cf. R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 9, p. 65; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 27, pp. 75-6; *infra*, Groups III, 27, IV, 35, V, Fp^1, no. 11 and Fr^{10}, no. 27.

[99] Similar in detail to no. 64 is the legend in *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. *fr.* 818, no. 77, cf. H. Kjellman (ed.), *La deuxième collection anglo-normande des miracles de la sainte Vierge et son original latin* (Paris and Upsala, 1921), no. 77, pp. 305-6. See also Arlette P. Ducrot-Granderye, 'Etudes sur les *Miracles Nostre Dame* de Gautier de Coinci,' *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Series B. XXV, 2 (Helsinki, 1932), 219 ff; Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, I, 44-5, no. 28. Ward in his description of the legend in *Ms Royal B.* xiv of the British Museum identifies 'Musilimo' as Masalmas, the Saracen leader who besieged Constantinople in 716, in the reign of Theodosius III, cf. *op. cit.*, II, 629 (11).

[100] Peter Damian relates the tale in *Opusc. XXXIV: Disputatio de variis apparitionibus et miraculis*, 3; PL, 145, 586-7. Cf. Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 17, p. 45.

[101] See Peter Damian, *ibid.*, 588-90.

[102] The source is Peter Damian, *Opusc. XXXIII: De bono suffragiorum*, 2; PL, 145. 563. Cf. *RR*, II, no. 9, 249-50; *infra*. Group III, 66.

intervenes and his spirit is permitted to return to his body that he may confess. He dies immediately afterwards. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 68^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 59; *Ma*, fol. 60; *Rc*, fol. 76; *Rv*^{3}, no. 173, fol. 103^{v}.

68. BISHOP BEATEN.[103] The writer of this legend recalls that St. Gregory appeared after his death to his successor and beat him for being avaricious, and for not continuing his charities. In this tale the Virgin appears to a bishop who has removed a poor cleric from a benefice on the pretext that he is *idiota* and who, now, according to Mary, is suffering from hunger, thirst, and cold. She orders the youth who accompanies her to strike the prelate on the back and shoulders. Needless to say, the cleric is recalled. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 70^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 59; *Ma*, fol. 61^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 79; *Rv*^{3}, no. 174, fol. 105.

69. VISION OF STS. PETER AND PAUL: MARINO'S VISION OF MARY.[104] The first part of the legend relates how Saints Peter and Paul appear to a dying priest who recovers the use of his tongue and is heard to speak with them. In a similar manner Mary appears to Marino, who becomes much vexed when those around his bed refuse to rise in her presence. They believe that he is delirious, but his spiritual director who knows his devotion to the Mother of God is not so skeptical. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 72; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 62; *Ma*, fol. 63; *Rc*, fol. 81; *Rv*^{3}, no. 175, fol. 106.

70. DYING CLERK.[105] A dying clerk who has been faithful in the recitation of the Hours of the Blessed Virgin dreads the judgment because of sins in his past life. He dies happily after she appears to him and gives him the assurance that he is forgiven. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 74; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 64; omitted in *Ma* and *Rc*; *Rv*^{3}, no. 176, fol. 107^{v}.

71. HILDEFONSUS.[106] After a long introduction concerning the writings of Hildefonsus, Archbishop of Toledo, it is related that he enters his Cathedral to celebrate the Mass of the vigil of the Assumption, and is presented with a branch of palm, signifying his victory over the world, the flesh, and the devil; he is told that he is clothed in a vestment of 'grace.' His successor dares to use the seat occupied by the Virgin and falls into disgrace and is banished. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 74^{v}; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 64^{v}; *Ma*, fol. 64^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 84^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, no. 177, fol. 108.[107]

72. ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY.[108] Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, suspends a priest for knowing only the Mass of the Blessed Virgin. She directs him to appeal to the prelate, giving as a sign a hairshirt which he had secretly hidden for future sewing and which she has completed. The priest is reinstated. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 76; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 66; *Ma*, fol. 66^{v}; *Rc*, fol. 86^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, no. 178, fol. 110^{v}.

73. UNWILLING TO DENY MARY.[109] An impoverished knight consults a wizard,

---

[103] The story of St. Gregory is from the *S. Gregorii Magni vita* of Paul the Deacon; PL, 75, 58. The legend of the Blessed Virgin, ordering the bishop to be beaten with a rod, is taken literally from Peter Damian, *ibid.*, 3; 564.

[104] Gregory the Great relates the first part of the legend in the *Dialogi*, IV, 12; pp. 243-5; Peter Damian tells of a Marinus consoled in his death agony, *loc. cit.;* 566.

[105] Cf. Peter Damian, *Opusc. X: De horis canonicis*, 10; PL, 145, 230.

[106] This version is based on the account of Cixila, Bishop of Toledo (770-783) who, not only relates the gift of a chasuble, but the promise: vestimentis gloriae jam in hac vita orneris. Cixila refers to the palm in a figurative way: Remansit Dei servus in tantum sollicitus de adipiscenda gloria, quantum perspicuus de sibi donata palma victoriae. *Vita S. Ildefonsi;* PL, 96, 48. For variants cf. Pez, no. 1, p. 82; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 38, pp. 190-1.

[107] At this point Duccio di Gano, compiler of *Rv*^{3}, makes an error in foliation which runs 108, 110, etc.

[108] The details of this version agree more nearly with the *Legenda aurea*, cap. 11; *ed. cit.*, p. 68 and the Old French version in *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. *fr.* 12483, printed by J. Morawski in *Romania*, LXI, 345-8 than with similar accounts by Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* VII, 4, ii, 5-6 or Thomas of Cantimpré, *op. cit.*, ii, 29 (12). In no. 72 the suspension occurs because of the priest's ignorance. It is not a question of morals as in Miélot, no. lviii or Kjellman, *op. cit.*, no. lix, pp. 255-63. See also Oswald Pelbart of Temesvar, *Pomerium de Sanctis hyemales et estivales* (Hagenaw, 1515), no. xxxv: *Magnum speculum exemplorum* VIII, no. 77, p. 526. Cf. *supra*, no. 63 and *infra*, Group V, *Fp*^{3}, no. 6.

[109] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *ibid.*, II, 12, i, 78 ff.; A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, no. 103, 217-8 or A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 83, pp. 206-7. Cf. E. Galtier, 'Byzantina,' *Romania*, XXIX (1900), 524-7; J. Morawski, *ibid.*, pp. 187-90.

but refuses to become rich by renouncing the Virgin. Repentant, he enters a Chapel to pray before a statue of the Madonna. The figure of the Virgin lays the Christ-Child on the altar and pleads for his forgiveness. This is witnessed by a rich knight who offers him the hand of his only daughter. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 77^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 66^v; *Ma*, fol. 67^v; *Rc*, fol. 88; *Rv*^{3}, no. 179, fol. 111.

74. THREE LANCES.[110] While Dominic is in the Basilica of St. Peter's in Rome, waiting for the confirmation of his Order by Pope Honorius III (1216-1227), he has a vision in which he sees Christ threatening to destroy the world with three lances because of the sins of avarice, pride and lust, and Mary interceding, promising to send her two servants. Dominic and Francis, to convert the world. FLa^2, fol. 79^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 68^v; *Ma*, fol. 69^v; *Rc*, fol. 110;[111] *Rv*^{3}, no. 180, fol. 113.

75. BEATRICE THE SACRISTAN.[112] Beatrice, sacristan of a convent in Cologne, leaves her keys at the feet of a statue of the Virgin and lives a worldly life for fifteen years. Repentant, she returns and finds that her duties have been performed by Mary and her absence has been undetected. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 80; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 69; *Ma*, omitted; *Rc*, fol. 111^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 181, fol. 113^v.

76. VISION OF MARY. After a short digression on the subject of purity, it is related that Mary appears to a saintly Cistercian, and in answer to his queries explains that the whiteness of her vesture is due to her sinlessness, and the splendor which surrounds her signifies that after her Son, God has destined her to be the light and splendor of a world which will find in her all virtues. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 82; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 71; *Ma*, fol. 70^v; *Rc*, fol. 91^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 182, fol. 115.

77. CRUST IN CHRIST'S WOUNDS.[113] A monk who finds the food served in the monastery unpalatable has a vision in which he is told by Mary to meditate on the Passion. She then gives him a crust of bread which she has dipped in Christ's wounds. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 83; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 71^v; *Ma*, fol. 71; *Rc*, fol. 92^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 183, fol. 115^v.

78. VIRGIN ACTS AS KNIGHT.[114] *FLa*^{2}, *Fr*^{3}, and *Rv*^{3} localize the legend in Portugal with the knight Pantaleon as the protagonist. On his way to a tournament he stops at the chapel of a monastery to hear Mass and continues to hear one after another until it is too late to go to the tournament. In the meantime he has been impersonated by the Virgin who has unhorsed twenty-five knights and even the King of Portugal. Upon leaving the chapel, Pantaleon is greeted as the hero of the day by his prisoners, and in bewilderment he accompanies them to his castle, makes them dine and take repose. Once alone he prays for

---

The Florentine, Jacopo Passavanti (d. 1357), recounts this and the next two legends in *Lo specchio della vera penitenza* I (Milan, 1808), pp. 115 ff. For variants cf. Crane, *The Exempla from the* Sermones Vulgares *of Jacques de Vitry*, no. 295, pp. 263-4; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 59, pp. 63-4. Add to these references P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 74, pp. 220-4; *infra*, Groups III, 75, and V, *Fr*^{10}, 50 and 101. For the legend, 'Unwilling to deny the Trinity' which Galtier (*loc. cit.*) gives as the original source of the Mary legend and which is found in the Greek manuscripts, cf. *infra*, Group IV, 44.

[110] *Legenda aurea*, cap. 113; *ed. cit.*, p. 470; Passavanti, *op. cit.*, I, 110. Cf. Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 48, p. cxlvii. The bull of confirmation was given Dec. 22, 1216.

[111] The compiler of *Rc* inserts 'Three Lances' and the next legend, 'Beatrice,' at the end of his collection. Cf. *infra*, the table for *Rc* in Group I, 78 and 80.

[112] Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum*, VII, 34, ii, 43. Cf. H. Watenphul, *Die Geschichte der Marienlegende von Beatrix der Küsterin* (Göttingen, 1904); also, R. Guiette, *La légende de la sacristine* (Paris, 1927); J. Passavanti, *op. cit.*, I, 229. A brief but thorough list of the variants is given by Crane in his notes to the *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry, *op. cit.*, no. 60, p. 160; by Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 25, pp. 48-9. Cf. J. Morawski, *ibid.*, pp. 172-3.

[113] The tale is frequently found among the mediaeval Latin *exempla*. Occasionally it is Christ, not Mary, who bids the monk to dip the crust in His wounds. Similar to no. 77 is the account of Odo of Cheriton, cf. Léopold Hervieux (ed.), *Les fabulistes latins depuis le siècle d'Auguste jusqu'à la fin du moyen âge* IV (Paris, 1896), no. 11, p. 269: and in Italian, cf. Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 44, p. 76. For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, p. 129, n.l. See also *infra*, Group V, *FLa*^{1}, no. 2.

[114] Caesarius of Heisterbach relates a similar tale of Walter of Birbech in the *Dialogus miraculorum*, VII, 38, ii, 49-50. Cf. Mussafia, *Studien*, III, 31; J. Morawski, *ibid.*, pp. 199-200. In the version of Alfonso el Sabio the knight is assisting the Count Don García in his expedition against the Moors at San Estebán de Gormaz, cf. *op. cit.*, I, 90-3, no. 63, with variants on pp. xlv-xlvi.

enlightenment and the Virgin appears to him, telling him the truth and urging him to a life of sanctity. Thereupon, Pantaleon frees the nobles, gives his goods to the poor and enters a monastery. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 83^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 72; *Ma*, fol. 71^v; *Rc*, fol. 93;[115] *Rv*^{3}, no. 184, fol. 116.

79. Our Lady of the Snow.[116] In a dream Pope Liberius (352-366) and John, a Patrician of Rome, are told by the Virgin to build a church where they will find snow. The next day, the fifth of August, snow is discovered on the Esquiline Hill and the site is selected for the Basilica of St. Mary Major. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 87^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 75; *Ma*, fol. 73^v; *Rc*, fol. 93^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 185, fol. 119.

80. Wife Resuscitated.[117] A knight daily retires to a private chapel dedicated to the Mother of God. His wife, thinking that he goes to visit his mistress, kills herself, but is restored to life by the Virgin at the knight's prayers. A child is born with a wound on its forehead; this is likewise healed. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 91^v; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 79; *Ma*, fol. 76^v; *Rc*, fol. 109;[118] *Rv*^{3}, no. 186, fol. 122.

81. Charitable Jew.[119] During a famine in Egypt a Jew gives away all his grain to the poor. In distress he is about to turn away a woman and child when he finds his barn miraculously filled. The visitors vanish. He and his family become Christian. *FLa*^{2}, fol. 92; *Fr*^{3}, fol. 79^v; *Ma*, fol. 77; *Rc*, fol. 100^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 187, fol. 122^v.

At this point *Fr*^{3} ends, *FLa*^{2} continues with the legend of St. Mary of Egypt, and *Rv*^{3} with that of St. Elizabeth. *Ma* and *Rc* still bear a resemblance to each other as the correspondence in the next six legends shows. Both manuscripts have consistently omitted objectionable stories; the first of the tales which follow is no. 77 in *Ma* and no. 72 in *Rc* (Cf. Chart).

Ma 77-*Rc* 72. No Death Without Confession.[120] A French knight is mortally wounded by his enemy but cannot die until his confession has been heard—a grace he obtains because he has always fasted on the vigils of the feasts of the Virgin that he may have a happy death. *Ma*, fol. 77^v; *Rc*, fol. 101^v.

Ma 78-*Rc* 73. Devil as Servant.[121] A devil enters the service of an impoverished knight who soon becomes rich through the efforts of his servant. A French bishop discovers from the devil's remarks on the age of the moon that he is an evil spirit in disguise. *Ma*, fol. 77^v; *Rc*, fol. 101^v.

Ma 79-*Rc* 77. Electuary.[122] A physician, who becomes a monk at Clairvaux, declines to eat the coarse food served in the monastery. He sees Mary enter and give a syrup to the other monks, but only after he promises to amend does he receive his portion. *Ma*, fol. 79^v; *Rc*, fol. 108^v.

---

[115] The compilers of *Ma* and *Rc* give just the bare details, do not name the knight nor localize the legend. Cf. *Legenda aurea*, cap. 131; *ed. cit.*, pp. 590-1 (2).

[116] The *Festum Dedicationis S. Mariae ad Nives*, celebrated on the fifth of August, was observed in the Basilica of St. Mary Major as early as the twelfth century. Gregory XI (1371) and Pius II (1453) gave the sanction of their authority to it. See Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, II, 428 ff., no. 309; Silvano Razzi, *De' miracoli di nostra donna* (Florence, 1595), pp. 43-4.

[117] Cf. Edmond Albe, *Les miracles de Notre-Dame de Roc-Amadour au xii^e siècle* (Paris, 1907), no. 7, p. 85; Hugo of Trimberg, *Solsequium*, ed. Erich Seemann (Munchener Texte, ix, Munich, 1914), no. 27, pp. 56-8. There is a version in Old French prose in *Ms* Paris, Bib. nat. *fr.* 7018^3, fol. 9^v; cf. Gustave Servois, 'Notices et extraits du recueil des miracles de Notre-Dame de Roc-Amadour.' *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des chartes*, XVIII (1856), 40-1; in Old English, cf. C. Horstmann, *Altenglische Legenden* (Heilbronn, 1881), p. 329; in German, cf. Johannes Bolte (ed.), 'Marienlegenden des xv Jahrhunderts,' *Alemannia*, XVII (1889), no. 10, pp. 8-9 and no. 34, pp. 18-9. See also Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, I, 133-5, no. 85; Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 547, no. 98 for *Ms Arundel* 506 (fol. 20), a fourteenth-century manuscript in the British Museum. Cf. *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{2}, fol. 74^{r-v}.

[118] Cf. *infra*, the table for *Rc* in Group I, no. 78.

[119] Etienne de Bourbon relates the story of a Saracen, *op. cit.*, no. 89, pp. 83-4. A Saracen is also the protagonist in *Mss* British Museum *Additional* 16589 (fol. 90), *Additional* 18364 (fol. 12), and *Additional* 27338 (fol. 67^v), cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 469, 607, 669 respectively. Alfonso el Sabio relates a similar tale of a charitable woman (*op. cit.*, II, 286, no. 203) and of a pagan in Sicily (*op. cit.*, II, 466-8, no. 335).

[120] See Etienne de Bourbon's story of a French knight of Nevers, *op. cit.*, no. 121, p. 104; Kjellman, *op. cit.*, no. 60, pp. 263-6 with variants on pp. lxxiv-lxxv; J. Morawski, in *Romania*, LXIV, 324, no. 2. Many different versions will be noted throughout this study: Groups II, 29 and 33: III, 18; IV, *Fn*^{4}, no. 54; V, *Fr*^{10}, nos. 45, 46, 47, 75, 77, and 122.

[121] Cf. *infra*, Group V, *Fn*^{5}, no. 12. Cf. *supra*, no. 36 which is slightly different.

[122] Herbert of Torres, *De Miraculis*; PL, 185^2, 1365; *Exordium magnum ordinis Cisterciensis* II, 19; *ibid.*, 1077. See also Caesarius of

Ma 80-*Rc* 74. SPEAKING IMAGE.[123] While a nun is praying before an image of Mary, she hears the Virgin speak to her Son. Joyful to be favored with such a miracle, the religious bursts out weeping. The writer notes that she differs from Mary Magdalen who wept from contrition, not as she does from devotion. *Ma*, fol. 79^v; *Rc*, fol. 103.

Ma 81-*Rc* 75. YOUTH SAVED FROM DEATH.[124] A youth in the service of a great Lord wins favor because of his integrity, but the master is persuaded by a jealous servant that the boy is in love with the Lady of the castle. Instructions are sent to the owner of a kiln that he is to throw into his furnace without question the messenger who will come to him on the following morning. The innocent boy stops to hear a Mass at a Lady-chapel and the envious servant, inquiring at the kiln, is burned to death. The Lord then discovers his error. *Ma*, fol. 80; *Rc*, fol. 103^v.

Ma 82-*Rc* 76. INCOMPLETE GARMENT.[125] Mary appears to a monk who says seventy-five *Aves* daily, showing him a garment which is three-fourths covered with *Aves*, and asking him to finish the other fourth. *Ma*, fol. 81; *Rc*, fol. 105.

At this point *Ma* ends and *Rc* continues with a short sermon on the Mass and the Eucharist (fols. 105^v-108^v). The compiler of *Rc* then goes back to the legend of the 'Electuary' for his no. 77, to the story of the 'Wife Resuscitated' (Group I, no. 80) for his no. 78, to the tales of the 'Three Lances' and 'Beatrice' (Group I, nos. 74 and 75) for his nos. 79 and 80. Before concluding his manuscript, he relates the three legends which follow:

Rc 81. 120 *Aves* DAILY. Fol. 112^v.[126]

Rc 82. CURED FOR A YEAR.[127] A girl named Margarita enters a convent much against her father's wishes. She is stricken with a fatal illness and is expected to die when the Blessed Virgin appears to her, cures her, and urges her to strive for sanctity within the next year when she will return to take her to heaven. She dies a year later. Fol. 113.

Rc 83. GIOVANNI ACUTO.[128] In the year 1370 a band of soldiers led by Giovanni Acuto, an Englishman, ravages the city of Faenza. The nuns in a convent are helpless and one of them flees to the chapel to pray that God will protect her

---

Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* VII, 47, ii, 67; A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, no. 89, 204-5; A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 69, pp. 193-4; Goswin Frenken (ed.), *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry* (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, V, Munich, 1914), no. xi, pp. 103-4; J. T. Welter (ed.), *La Tabula exemplorum secundum ordinem alphabeti, recueil d'exempla compilé en France à la fin du xiiie siècle* (Paris, 1926), no. 270, p. 71 with variants on p. 113, n. 270. Levi gives an Italian version, *op. cit.*, no. 28, pp. 52-3. See also Bonavesin da Riva, *Vulgare de Eleemosynis*, ed. I Bekker, *Bericht über die zur Bekanntmachung geeigneten Verhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1850), no. 3, pp. 453-6, ll. 610-737. For variants cf. Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 32, p. 52. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 54.

[123] Cf. J. T. Welter, *op. cit.*, no. 217, p. 58 and n. 125; n. 217

[124] Etienne de Bourbon, *op. cit.*, no. 373, pp. 329-30. Cf. Wilhelm Hertz, *Deutsche Sage im Elsass* (Stuttgart, 1872), pp. 278-93; E. Galtier, *op. cit.*, pp. 507-13; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 64, p. 286; Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, I, 125-7, no. 78 with variants on pp. xlvi-xlvii. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fn^1, fol. 60 and Fr^5, no. 40. For the other version of the 'Fridolin' legend where the calumny hinges on the motif of bad breath, cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 22.

[125] Cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 165, no. 44 and n. 44; A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 24, p. 133; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 50, pp. 133-4; *infra*, Group III, 50.

[126] Cf. *supra*, Group I, 4.

[127] 'Cured for a Year' is found in an Italian manuscript of the fourteenth century, Vatican City, Vat. *lat.* 5086 (fol. 199) together with the next legend, 'Giovanni Acuto.' Cf. *infra*, Group V, Rv^1.

[128] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Rv^1 (fol. 200). The same version may be found in the 15th century manuscript, Verona, Bib. Comunale 1224 (fol. 105). See also Francesco Zambrini (ed.), *Martirio d'una fanciulla Faentina narrato per Frate Filippo da Siena nel secolo xiv* (Scelta di curiosità letterarie, 3, Bologna, 1861), pp. 8-12. Giovanni Acuto is the italianized form of the name, Sir John Hawkwood (d. 1394) who attained great renown as a *condottiere* in the Italian wars of the fourteenth century. Under his leadership Faenza was destroyed in 1378.

virginity. A soldier enters and attracted by her beauty is about to make off with her, when another disputes his claim. They are deciding it by duel when Acuto appears and, rather than lose a soldier, he martyrs the nun. Fols. 115-117.

4. TABLE OF CORRESPONDENCE.

The following table, showing omissions, illustrates more clearly the relationship between FLa^2 and Fr^3, *Ma* and *Rc*, Fp^2 and Fr^6, and the use which Duccio di Gano of Pisa, compiler of Rv^3, made of the legends of Group I.

	FLa^2	Fr^3	*Ma*	*Rc*	Rv^3	Fp^2	Fr^5	Fp^4	Fr^6
1. Pilgrim in the Sea	1	1	1	1	128	1	1	..	
2. Light on the Masthood	2	2	2	2	129	2	2	..	..
3. Hours Sung Daily	3	3	3	3	130	3	3	..	.
4. 120 *Aves* Daily; Saved from Drowning	4	4	4	4	131	4	..	3	.
5. Two Devils in Prison	5	5	5	..	132	5	4	..	.
6. Robber Slapped	6	6	6	5	133	6	5	..	.
7. Painter; Baby Saved	7	7	7	6	..	7	..	4	.
8. Barns Filled	8	8	8	7	134	8	6	..	
9. Alexius in the Mine	9	9	9	8	135	9	7	5	..
10. Drowned Sacristan	10	10	10	..	136	10	8	..	..
11. Milk	11	11	11	9	137	11	9		..
12. Mary with Sts. Martin and Nicholas	12	12	12	10	138	12	10	..	..
13. Love by Black Art	13	13	13	11	139	13	11	..	.
14. Mary's Name in Gold Letters	14	14	14	12	140	14	12	..	..
15. Will for Deed	15	15	15	13	141	15	13	6	..
16. Knight and Squire	16	16	16	14	142	16	14	..	..
17. Abbot Elsinus	17	17	17	15	..	17	..	..	..
18. Drowned Sacristan	18	18	18	..	.	18	15	..	..
19. Charitable Almsman	19	19	19	16	..	19	16	..	..
20. Bread to the Christ-Child	20	20	20	17	..	20	17	..	..
21. Severed Hand	21	21	21*	18	..	21	18	..	..
22. Prefect of Rome	22	22	22	19	143	22*	19		1
23. Nun's Penance Left Uncompleted	23	23	..	..	144	23	20	..	..
24. Two Brothers at Rome	24	24	23	20	145	24	21	.	..
25. Nativity of the Virgin	25	25	24	21	..	25	22	..	.
26. Octave of the Nativity	26	26	25	22	..	26	23	..	..
27. Image of Sardinay	27	27	26	23	..	27	24	..	..
28. Pilgrim of St. James	28	28	27	24	..	28	25	.	.
29. Virgin Comes to Devil	29	29	28	25	..	29	26	..	.
30. Monks by the Riverside	30	30	29	26	..	30	27	..	.
31. Five Joys	31	31*	30	27	..	31	28	..	.
32. Vision of Judgment	32*	32*	31	28	146	32	29	..	.
33. Virgin's Choir	33	33	32	29	147	33	30	..	..
34. Christ-Child Seized as Pledge	34	34	33	30	..	34	31	..	2
35. Taper Left Behind by an Angel	35	35	34	31	148	35	32	..	..
36. Devil as Servant	36	36	35*	32	..	36	33	..	.
37. Toledo	37	37	36	33	149	37	34	..	.
38. Hours of the Virgin	38	38	37	34	150	38	35		.
39. Blaspheming Merchant	39	39	38	35	151	39	36	.	
40. St. John the Almoner	40	40	39	36	152	..	..		.
41. St. Elizabeth's Vision	41	41	40	37	153	..	..	..	
42. Siege of Chartres	42	42	41	38	..	.	..		..
43. Theophilus	43	43	42*	39	154	.		.	.
44. St. John Damascene	44	44	43	40	155			.	.

* Incomplete

	FLa^2	*Fr*^{3}	*Ma*	*Rc*	*Rv*^{3}	*Fp*^{2}	*Fr*^{5}	*Fp*^{4}	*Fr*^{6}
45. Disobedient Son	45	45	44	41	156	..	..	..	..
46. Foundation of Dominican Order	46	46	45	42	157	..	..	..	..
47. Julian the Apostate	47	47	46	43	158	..	..	..	..
48. Brother of the King of Hungary	48	48	47	44	159	..	..	..	..
49. Demons as Swine	49	49	48	45	160	..	..	..	..
50. Landmarks Removed	50	50	49	46	161	..	..	..	..
51. Sight Restored	51	51	50	47	162	..	..	..	..
52. Drowned Clerk	52	52	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
53. Litany Chanted	53	53	51	48	163	..	..	..	..
54. Mother-in-law and Son-in-law	54	54	52	49	..	..	..	..	..
55. Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*	55	55	53	50	164	..	..	..	..
56. Eucharistic Miracle	56	56	54	51	..	..	..	..	..
57. Jewish Boy	57	57	55	52	..	..	..	..	..
58. Prayer Puts Devil to Flight	58	58	56	53	165	..	..	..	..
59. Ploughing on the Magdalen's Day	59	59	57	54	166	..	..	..	..
60. Thief Sustained	60	60	58	55	..	..	..	..	..
61. Mary and Bridegroom	61	61	59	56	167	..	..	..	..
62. Vision of Judgment	62	62	..	..	168	..	..	..	..
63. Priest of One Mass	63	63	60	57	169	..	..	..	..
64. Siege of Constantinople	64	64	61	58	170	..	..	..	..
65. Delivered from Purgatory	65	65	62	59	171	..	..	..	..
66. Office of the Dead	66	66	63	60	172	..	..	..	..
67. Monk Revived for Confession	67	67	64	61	173	..	..	..	..
68. Bishop Beaten	68	68	65	62	174	..	..	..	
69. Vision of Sts. Peter and Paul; Marino.	69	69	66	63	175	..	..	..	..
70. Dying Clerk	70	70	..	..	176	..	..	..	..
71. Hildefonsus	71	71	67	64	177	..	..	..	..
72. St. Thomas of Canterbury	72	72	68	65	178	..	..	..	..
73. Unwilling to Deny Mary	73	73	69	66	179	..	..	..	..
74. Three Lances	74	74	70	79	180	..	..	..	..
75. Beatrice	75	75	..	80	181	..	..	..	..
76. Vision of Mary	76	76	71	67	182	..	..	..	..
77. Crust in Christ's Wounds	77	77	72	68	183	..	..	..	..
78. Virgin Acts as Knight	78	78	73	69	184	..	..	..	..
79. Our Lady of the Snow	79	79	74	70	185	..	..	..	..
80. Wife Resuscitated	80	80	75	78	186	..	..	..	..
81. Charitable Jew	81	81	76	71	187	..	..	..	..
No Death without Confession	..	..	77	72	..	..	..	..	..
Devil as Servant	..	..	78	73	..	..	..	..	..
Electuary	..	..	79	77	..	..	..	..	..
Speaking Image	..	..	80	74	..	..	..	..	..
Youth Saved from Death	..	..	81	75	..	..	..	..	..
Incomplete Garment	..	..	82	76	..	..	..	..	..
120 *Aves* Daily	..	..	..	81	..	..	..	..	..
Cured for a Year	..	..	..	82	..	..	..	..	..
Giovanni Acuto	..	..	..	83	..	..	..	..	..

A study of the chart for Group I would lead one to conclude that *FLa*^{2} and *Fr*^{3}, both containing the series of eighty-one legends which constitutes the *Libro del Naufragio*, are closely related. No. 32 in *FLa*^{2} is incomplete and *Fr*^{3} gives only the rubrics of no. 31 and the last part of no. 32; therefore, one may presuppose a manuscript which was the architype and which was used by the compilers of the other manuscripts considered in Group I.

Rc and *Ma* both contain a short version of no. 78, 'The Virgin Acts as Knight', not found in FLa^2, Fr^3 and Rv^3; both omit nos. 23, 52, 62, and 70. But the manuscripts are dissimilar: *Ma* contains nos. 5, 10, and 18, omitted in *Rc*, and omits no. 75 which the compiler of *Rc* inserts towards the end of the collection as no. 80. *Rc* adds the last three legends, nos. 81, 82, and 83. The scribes of *Ma* frequently enlarge upon the text of the versions found in FLa^2, Fr^3 and Rv^3; *Rc* does not. *Ma* contains three incomplete legends, nos. 21, 35, and 42.

In Rv^3 the compiler, Duccio di Gano of Pisa, consistently omits all legends which appear in synopsized or variant form in the first part of his collection. He could not have used *Rc* which does not contain his nos. 136, 144, 168, and 176. Only a close study of the text would permit one to decide whether he used FLa^2 directly or another manuscript akin to Fr^3.

As for the shorter manuscripts, Fp^2 and Fr^5, Fp^2 presents without omission the first thirty-nine legends of the *Libro del Naufragio; Fr^5* omits nos. 4, 7, and 17. Fp^2 and Fr^5 are identical for the next two legends not taken from Group I, and then the similarity ceases; the scribe of Fr^5 continues with legends taken from the *Libro del Cavaliere* (Cf. Group V, Fp^2 and Fr^5).

Of the six Mary legends in Fp^4, four are from Group I; two are from Group IV.[129] Both legends contained in Fr^2 are from the *Libro del Naufragio.*[130]

II. Manuscripts of Mary Legends in Italian: Group II.

Ezio Levi d'Ancona indicates four manuscripts[1] as belonging to the series, called the *Libro del Cavaliere*: *Mss* Florence, Bib. Riccardiana 1408 and Riccardiana 1431, Naples, Bib. Naz. xii.F.25 and Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220. A close study reveals that, although *Mss* Riccardiano 1408 and 1431 are related to each other, they are quite distinct from the other two. These Florentine manuscripts begin with the legend which has given the name, *Libro del Cavaliere,* to the series. They contain only thirty and thirty-three Marian legends,[2] respectively. *Ms* Riccardiano 1431 has only twenty of the fifty-nine tales found in Naples, Bib. Naz. xii.F.25; *Ms* Riccardiano 1408, only seventeen of these fifty-nine. There is evidence that neither of the compilers of the Florentine manuscripts used Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220.[3]

Nevertheless, *Mss* Riccardiano 1408 and 1431 constitute a series, important in manuscript relations inasmuch as a number of compilers drew from this series only. The compiler of *Ms* Florence, Bib. Naz. *Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70 found the shorter and longer series sufficiently different from each other to use each as a source. Differences in vocabulary and structure, in the details of the narratives, and in the sequence make it advisable to treat *Mss* Riccardiano 1408 and 1431 with their related manuscripts as Group II and the longer manuscripts of the *Libro del Cavaliere* as Group III.

---

[129] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 2 and 14.

[130] While it was not the purpose of this study to show the relationship between the *Libro del Naufragio* and other collections, it might be noted in passing that twenty-four of the legends in the series are in the Pez collection. A study of details points to the direct use of the *Legenda aurea* and the legends in the works of Peter Damian and Peter the Venerable. One does not find this close adherence to detail in those stories first related by Gregory of Tours, Guibert of Nogent, Walter of Cluny, Honorius of Autun, and Herbert of Torres, or the legends contained in the thirteenth-century collections of Vincent of Beauvais, Caesarius of Heisterbach, Jacques de Vitry, and Etienne de Bourbon. The tales are revised to make them more dramatic. The long version of 'The Virgin Acts as Knight' (no. 78) is typical of this tendency.

[1] *Il libro dei cinquanta miracoli della Vergine*, p. xcvi, n. 1.

[2] Levi erroneously notes twenty-nine and thirty-five Mary legends respectively, *ibid.*, p. lxv.

[3] Mary legends, nos. 12 and 28, Group II, are in *Ms* Naples, Bib. Naz. xii F. 25, but not in Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220.

1. ANALYSIS OF GROUP II.

Fr^8—Riccardiano 1431,[4] containing thirty-three Mary legends (fols. 62-79), is the work of Luigi Rucellai and is dated 1469.

Fr^7—Riccardiano 1408,[5] a fifteenth-century manuscript in the same library, contains thirty Marian tales (fols. 108-116).

Rv^2—Vaticano *lat.* 8085[6] is a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Vatican Library, containing twenty-one Mary legends (fols. 119-136) of which twenty are from Group II.

Fn^4—*Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70[7] in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence is also of the fifteenth century. It is a collection of 152 legends (fols. 16^v-78) of which nos. 67 to 97 are drawn from Group II.

Rv^3—Vaticano *Barberino lat.* 4032 has already been considered in Group I.[8] The compiler, Duccio di Gano of Pisa, used the subjects of the legends in Group II for twenty-one of the Marian tales in his collection.

Fp^3—*Palatino* LXXIII[9] is a manuscript of the fifteenth century in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale at Florence. Of its thirty Mary legends (fols. 198-218) only nos. 3, 10-18, and 27 correspond to Group II.

2. THE CONTENT OF EACH LEGEND IN GROUP II.

1. VIRGIN COMES TO DEVIL INSTEAD OF HIS VICTIM. Cf. Group I, 29 for summary; Fr^8, fol. 62; Fr^7, fol. 108; Rv^2, fol. 129^v; Fn^4, no. 94, fol. 45.

2. DEVIL AS SERVANT. Cf. Group I, 36;[10] Fr^8, fol. 63^v; Fr^7 omitted; Rv^2, fol. 130; Fn^4, no. 68, fol. 40.

3. COULD LEARN ONLY *Ave Maria*. Cf. Group I, 55; Fr^8, fol. 64^v; Fr^7, omitted; Rv^2, fol. 130^v; Fn^4, no. 67, fol. 40.

4. MOTHER-IN-LAW AND SON-IN-LAW. Cf. Group I, 54; Fr^8, fol. 64^v; Fr^7, omitted; Rv^2, fol. 130^v; Fn^4, no. 93, fol. 45; Rv^3, no. 93, fol. 51.

5. UNWILLING TO DENY MARY. A servant, having squandered the wealth of his master, has recourse to the evil spirit to regain it. He agrees to deny God but refuses to submit to the devil's demand that he deny Mary. Thereupon he is beaten. Bruised and wounded, he enters a church and begs help from her. His master enters and sees the Virgin healing the wounds of the servant whom he then sets free and makes wealthy.[11] Fr^8, fol. 65^v; Fr^7, fol. 109; Rv^2, fol. 131; Fn^4, no. 69, fol. 40^v; Rv^3, no. 94, fol. 51^v; Fp^3, no. 10, fol. 201^v.

6. 150 *Aves* DAILY.[12] The Virgin appears to a girl who has the custom of saying 150 *Aves* daily, and requests that she say them more slowly, and particularly the words, *Dominus tecum*. Fr^8, fol. 66^v; Fr^7, fol. 109; Rv^2, fol. 131^v; Fn^4, no. 70, fol. 40^v; Rv^3, omitted;[13] Fp^3, no. 11, fol. 202.

---

[4] Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxv; S. Morpurgo, *I manoscritti della R. Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze*, pp. 466-7.

[5] Levi, *op. cit.*, pp. lxiv-lxv; S. Morpurgo, *op. cit.*, p. 447.

[6] Levi, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxvii-lxxix. According to Levi, there are nineteen Mary legends in this manuscript. He has omitted the *incipit* for the eleventh (cf. *infra*, no. 11) and numbers both thirteen and fourteen as twelve.

[7] Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lvii. The number of legends contained in Fn^4 is given as 156 by Levi. This is the number given in the index. In reality no. 152 is incomplete and fols. 79-88 are blank, a space which probably would have been used by the scribe for nos. 153, 154, 155 and 156. Cf. infra, *Group* III, 71-5.

[8] Cf. *supra*. Nos. 128-83 in Rv^3 were from Group I.

[9] Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lx; L. Gentile, *I codici Palatini* I, 76; *infra* Group V. The copyist, 'Pagholo di Piero del Perse' (fol. 139), complains in the midst of his work (fol. 89): Qui ò finito di scrivere questi capitoli, e non posso iscrivere gli altri che seguono per ordine dopo questi, perch'io non posso più tenere questo libro ch'è della conpagnia di santa brigida di firenze. Cf. *supra*, Group I, n. 16.

[10] In Group I, 36 the devil acts as servant for fourteen years. In Groups II and III, the time element is twelve years. See also P. Misciattelli, *Miracoli della gloriosa Vergine Maria*, no. 2, pp. 6-8.

[11] Cf. *supra*, Group I, 73.

[12] Cf. *supra*, Group I, 4 ('120 *Aves* Daily'). For variants cf. Crane's notes to the reprint of Pez, no. 32, p. 97; A. Hilka, *Die Wundergeschichten des Caesarius von Heisterbach* III, 176, n. 57.

[13] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 59.

7. Hand on the Convent-Door.[14] A nun stops to say a prayer to the Virgin before leaving her convent, but finding a hand on the lock and hearing a voice reprimanding her, she returns to her cell repentant. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 66^{v}; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 109^{v}; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 131^{v}; *Fn*^{4}, omitted; *Rv*^{3}, no. 95, fol. 52.

8. Pilgrim's Staff.[15] A Cistercian monk on his way to Rome to receive the confirmation of his episcopal appointment notices a pilgrim's staff which has leafed with the words *Ave Maria* upon each leaf. He investigates and finds the incorrupt body of a pilgrim who had been assaulted by robbers. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 67; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 109^{v}; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 131^{v}; *Fn*^{4}, no. 71, fol. 41; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[16] *Fp*^{3}, no. 13, fol. 202.

9. Five Joys.[17] Cf. Group I, 31; *Fr*^{8}, fol. 67^{v}; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 110; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 132; *Fn*^{4}, no. 72, fol. 41; *Rv*^{3}, no. 96, fol. 52; *Fp*^{3}, no. 12, fol. 202.

10. Pact With The Devil.[18] A man, wretchedly poor, makes a pact with the devil. He becomes repentant upon seeing an image of Mary in a church and despite the buffeting of the evil spirit he runs within. Three times the Virgin drives him from her presence, and then relenting, promises to obtain forgiveness from her Son. Through her assistance he also obtains the charter signed in his blood. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 67^{v}; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 110; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 132; *Fn*^{4}, no. 73, fol. 41; *Rv*^{3}, no. 97, fol. 52; *Fp*^{3}, no. 14, fol. 202^{v}.

11. Discord Between Husband and Wife.[19] A woman who lives peaceably with her husband is deceived by the devil who, appearing to her in the form of the Virgin, advises her to neglect domestic duties for prayer. The wife does not realize the deception until the third apparition when the evil spirit attempts to throw her into a well. At the invocation of Mary the devil vanishes. Reconciliation with her husband follows. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 68^{v}; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 110^{v}; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 132^{v}; *Fn*^{4}, no. 95, fol. 46; *Rv*^{3}, no. 98, fol. 52^{v}; *Fp*^{3}, no. 15, fol. 202^{v}.

12. Severed Hand.[20] In this version the Virgin discontinues appearing to the Bishop of 'Toletta' during his Mass. The bishop concludes that his impure thoughts as the result of his hand being kissed were more than mere temptations, and he has a servant cut it off. The canons of the Cathedral insist that he celebrate Mass on a Marian feast. At his urgent prayers Mary restores his hand. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 69^{v}; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 111; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 133; *Fn*^{4}, no. 88, fol. 43^{v}; *Rv*^{3}, no. 99, fol. 52^{v}; *Fp*^{3}, no. 16, fol. 203^{v}.

13. Hospitality.[21] A hermit goes to a nearby city to sell the baskets he has woven. He spends the proceeds of his labor on a beautiful image of the Virgin. On his return home he gets lost and at nightfall begs for hospitality at an unknown inn. His host, an aged man, overwhelms him with courtesies, and his hostess, a beautiful woman to whom he shows the image, counsels him to live a sinless life and to be devout to the Mother of God if he would advance in perfection. The next morning the aged host reveals that he is St. Peter and the woman,

---

[14] See H. Isnard, 'Recueil des miracles de la Vierge du XIII^{e} siècle,' *Bulletin de la Société archéologique . . . du vendomois*, XXVI (1887), no. 27, 116-8. Cf. *supra*, 'Beatrice the Sacristan,' Group I, 75; *infra*, Group V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 131.

[15] For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 186-7, n. 69. Cf. *infra*, Group IV; 64. See also *Ms* British Museum *Harley* 268 (fol. 25^{v}) described by Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 566 (93). The Spanish version differs but slightly, cf. Climente Sanchez, *El libro de exemplos*, ed. A. Morel-Fatio in *Romania*, VII (1878), no. 43, 509.

[16] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 64.

[17] The legend, 'Seven Joys' is given in the *Libro del Cavaliere*, cf. *infra*, Group III, 8.

[18] A variant of the 'Theophilus' legend, cf. *supra*, Groups I, 43 and *infra*, III, 9; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 9, pp. 20-3.

[19] Cf. *infra*, Groups III, 40 and V, *Fr*^{10}, no. 17; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 40, pp. 110-2.

[20] Cf. *infra*, Group III, 41; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 41, pp. 112-4; see also *supra*, Group I, 21 where a somewhat similar tale is told of Pope Leo I.

[21] Cf. Goswin Frenken (ed), *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry*, no. 4, pp. 97-9, or Joseph Greven (ed.), *Die Exempla aus den Sermones feriales et communes des Jakob von Vitry* (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, XIX, Heidelberg, 1914), no. 4, pp. 5-8: Etienne de Bourbon, *op. cit.*, no. 152, pp. 129-31. See also *infra*, Group III, 42; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 42, pp. 115-7.

Mary. The house suddenly disappears and the hermit finds his cell quite easily. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 70^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 111^v; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 133^v; *Fn*^{4}, no. 89, fol. 43^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 100, fol. 53^v; *Fp*^{3}, omitted.

14. Painter.[22] Cf. Group I, 7; *Fr*^{8}, fol. 71^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 133^v; *Fn*^{4}, no. 74, fol. 41; *Rv*^{3}, omitted;[23] *Fp*^{3}, no. 17, fol. 203^v.

15. Christ-Child and *Ave Maria*.[24] A woman very devout to Mary entertains a great desire to behold the Child Jesus. One day she sees a beautiful boy in church who asks her if she knows the *Ave Maria*. She begins to say the prayer and at the words, 'Blessed is the fruit of thy womb,' he reveals his identity and vanishes. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 71^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 134; *Fn*^{4}, no. 75, fol. 41^v; *Rv*^{3}, omitted; *Fp*^{3}, no. 18, fol. 204.

16. Blasphemer of Lombardy.[25] A dicer swears that his knife may be thrust into the body of the Virgin if he does not speak the truth. His knife becomes bloody and he falls dead. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 72; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112; omitted in *Rv*^{2}, *Rv*^{3} and *Fp*^{3}; *Fn*^{4}, no. 76, fol. 41^v.

17. Merchant of Alexandria.[26] A merchant of Alexandria, before going to Constantinople on business, commends his wife and daughter to the protection of the Virgin. His servant attempts to rob and kill them, but becomes blinded and strikes himself. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 72; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112^v; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 134; *Fn*^{4}, no. 77, fol. 42; *Rv*^{3}, no. 125, fol. 64.

18. Bread to The Christ-Child. Cf. Group I, 20. In this version it is the mother who urges the child to offer the bread. The miracle takes place before an image of the Madonna in her own home, not at church. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 72^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112^v; *Rv*^{2}, omitted; *Fn*^{4}, no. 78, fol. 42; *Rv*^{3}, no. 126, fol. 64^v.

19. Robber Slapped.[27] Cf. Group I, 6; *Fr*^{8}, fol. 73; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 112^v; *Rv*^{2}, omitted; *Fn*^{4}, no. 96, fol. 46^v; omitted here in *Rv*^{3}.[28]

20. The Virgin's Ring of Espousals.[29] For the construction of an altar in a Lady-chapel a rich and devout merchant buys materials from a Jew who tells him that he has the ring of the Virgin's espousals and that she will give him no peace until he puts it in Christian hands. The merchant keeps it in a secret place. His son suddenly dies and during the burial service, rising from the catafalque, warns his father that the ring is not for private devotion. It is afterwards reserved in the public chapel of a monastery. A countess of the Province of Chiusa tries on the ring. For her irreverence her finger withers. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 73^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 113; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 134; *Fn*^{4}, no. 97, fol. 46^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 127, fol. 64^v.

21. Nativity of The Virgin.[30] Cf. Group I, 25; *Fr*^{8}, fol. 74^v; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 113^v; *Rv*^{2}, omitted; *Fn*^{4}, no. 90, fol. 44; *Rv*^{3}, no. 73, fol. 43^v.

22. Siege of Chartres. Cf. Group I, 42; *Fr*^{8}, fol. 75; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 114; *Rv*^{2}, fol. 134^v; *Fn*^{4}, no. 79, fol. 42; *Rv*^{3}, no. 74, fol. 43^v.

23. Blasphemer of Sardinia.[31] A dicer curses using the name of the Mother of God and falls dead. *Fr*^{8}, fol. 75; *Fr*^{7}, fol. 114; *Rv*^{2}, omitted; *Fn*^{4}, no. 83, fol. 42^v; *Rv*^{3}, no. 75, fol. 44.

---

[22] Cf. *infra*, Group III, 10; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 10, pp. 23-4.

[23] Two versions are already given in *Rv*^{3}, cf. Group IV, 29 and 47.

[24] Cf. Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* VIII, 8, ii, 87-8; Introduction to Jean Miélot, no. 40; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 21, p. 47; J. Morawski, 'Mélanges de littérature pieuse,' *Romania*, LXI (1935), 169-70. See also the slightly different version in Group III, 72; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 72, pp. 216-7; *infra*, Group IV, *Rv*^{3}, 72.

[25] Cf. Climente Sanchez, *art. cit.*, in *Romania* VII, no. 54, 514-5.

[26] Johannes Monachus, *Liber de miraculis*, ed. M. Huber (Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, V, Heidelberg, 1913), no. 11, pp. 55-6; Johannes Moschos, *Pratum spirituale*, cap. lxxv, PL 74, 154. See also C. Stolfi (ed.), *Corona de' monaci*, no. 91, p. 215; P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 43, pp. 117-8; *infra*, Group III, 43.

[27] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 44, pp. 119-20; *infra*, Group III, 44.

[28] Cf. *supra*, Group I, 6 where the legend occurs as no. 133 in *Rv*^{3}.

[29] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 45, pp. 120-2; *infra*, Groups III, 45 and V, *Fp*^{2}, no. 41 and *Fr*^{5}, no. 38.

[30] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 46, pp. 122-4; *infra*, Group III, 46.

[31] Cf. *supra*, Groups I, 39 and II, 16. Cf. also Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* VII, 104; Caesarius of Heisterbach,

24. Eyes Removed.[32] In honor of Mary's virginity a young French girl promises her to remain chaste. Finding that a count has fallen in love with her because of the beauty of her eyes, she removes them. Fr^8, fol. 75; Fr^7, fol. 114; omitted in Rv^2 and Rv^3; Fn^4, no. 91, fol. 44.

25. *Ave Maria* in Letters of Gold.[33] A youth consults a saintly religious as to the best manner in which to honor the Mother of God. The latter is granted a vision of a garment on which is embroidered the *Ave Maria* in letters of gold. Fr^8, fol. 76; Fr^7, fol. 114^v; Rv^2, fol. 134^v; Fn^4, no. 85, fol. 43; Rv^3, no. 76, fol. 44.

26. One Knee.[34] The Virgin appears and bathes only one knee of a devotee who had never knelt on both in saying his prayers. Fr^8, fol. 76^v; Fr^7, fol. 114^v; omitted in Rv^2 and Fn^4; Rv^3, no. 77, fol. 44.

27. Ecstasy During *Te Deum*. A clerk, while devoutly chanting the *Te Deum*, comes to the words, 'Ne horruisti virginis uterum,' and is transported into Heaven where he is presented to Christ by Mary as 'il mio chappellano.' Fr^8, fol. 76^v; Fr^7, fol. 114^v; Rv^2, omitted; Fn^4, no. 81, fol. 42^v;[35] Rv^3, no. 78, fol. 44^v.[36]

28. Dainties Covered by a Soiled Cloth.[37] A sinner amends his life after a vision of Mary who offers him dainty food covered with a soiled cloth as a symbol of his daily prayers in a life of sin. Fr^8, fol. 76^v; Fr^7, fol. 114^v; omitted in Rv^2 and Rv^3; Fn^4, no. 80, fol. 42^v; Fp^3, no. 3, fol. 199.

29. No Death Without Confession.[38] A knight who has fasted on Saturday in honor of the Mother of God is beheaded during a siege but cannot die until he has confessed and received the Sacraments of the Dying. Fr^8, fol. 77; Fr^7, fol. 115; Fn^4, no. 82, fol. 42^v; Rv^3, no. 79, fol. 44^v.

30. One-Eyed Knight.[39] Two Jews in Paris make fun of the Mother of God during the singing of a hymn in her honor. Thereupon a knight kills one with a blow, but the other escapes and at the king's court, accuses him of homicide, describing him as one-eyed. The knight is acquitted through the miraculous recovery of his eye. Fr^8, fol. 77; Fr^7, fol. 115; Rv^2, no. 20, fol. 135; Fn^4, no. 84, fol. 42^v; Rv^3, no. 107, fol. 57^v.

31. Incest.[40] A very devout woman yields to the temptation of the evil spirit and commits incest with her son. The devil makes her sin known, and she is summoned to court. Mary appears in her stead much to the confusion of the devil who disappears, leaving behind a dead, putrid body which he had assumed. Fr^8, fol. 78; Fr^7, fol. 115^v; Fn^4, no. 92, fol. 44^v; Rv^3, no. 81, fol. 45; Rv^2, omitted; Fp^3, no. 24, fol. 210.

Dialogus miraculorum **VII, 43, ii, 62; Villecourt,** *op. cit.*, no. 51, pp. 282-3.

[32] Group II, 24 corresponds to the legend in Group III, 51*A* (cf. *infra*) and to no. 51 in the reprint of Incunabula *A* by Claudiano Conte Sormani Moretti (ed.), *Li miracoli della Madonna* (Parma, 1841). For the version in which Richard of England is a protagonist, cf. *infra*, Group III, 13; for the Italian variant of 'Suor Dea and Giubideo' **cf. *infra*, Group V, Fn^8, no. 1 and n. 127.**

[33] Compare this version with the legend 'Incomplete Garment,' *supra*, Group I, *Ma* 82-*Rc* 76.

[34] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 40.

[35] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, Fn^4, no. 58.

[36] Duccio di Gano gives the same rubrics for nos. 78 and 79 in Rv^3 (cf. Group II, 29, 'No Death without Confession'): D'uno che gli fu moço il capo dimandò poi penitentia.

[37] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 53, pp. 138-9; *infra*, Group III, 53. In *Ms Additional* 11579 of the British Museum there is a tale of dainty food on a soiled table-cloth, cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 529 (18); most of the Latin collections contain the version 'Dainties in a Foul Dish,' cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, no. 100, 215, n. 100; *infra*, Group IV, Rv^3, no. 51; Fn^4, no. 51.

[38] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 18, pp. 54-5; *infra*, Group III, 18. Cf. Thomas of Cantimpré, *Bonum universale de apibus* II, 29; Johannes Herolt, *Promptuarium Discipuli de miraculis beate Marie Virginis* (Venice, 1606), nos. 52, 53, and 54, p. 24. See also Alfonso el Sabio, *Cantigas de Santa Maria* I, 150-2, no. 96 with variants on pp. xxxiii-xxxiv; *ibid.*, pp. 186-7, no. 124. Cf. *supra*, Group I, n. 120; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 7, p. 42.

[39] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 54, pp. 140-1; *infra*, Group III, 54. Cf. J. Morawski in *Romania* LXI, 319; Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 658 (16): J. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 445 (8) and 550 (128).

[40] P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 55, pp. 142-4; *infra*, Group III, 55. The legend is not localized at Rome as in the early versions and is more simple than the Italian version in Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 14, pp. 30-2. For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 192-3, n. 77; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 20, pp. 176-7.

32. Three Counsels in Humility.[41] A Cistercian abbot asks a dying monk what acts he deems most meritorious during his religious life. The monk reveals that once he had been favored by an apparition of the Mother of God who had advised him to practice humility in clothing, food, and manners in order to overcome the temptations of the evil spirit. Fr^8, fol. 78^v; Fr^7, fol. 116; Fn^4, no. 86, fol. 43; Rv^3, no. 80, fol. 44^v; Rv^2 and Fp^3, omitted.

33. No Death Without Confession.[42] During a battle between the citizens of Bologna and Modena a knight, who had the practice of fasting on the vigils of Marian feasts to obtain the grace of a happy death, is mortally wounded. He miraculously lives four days until he can be given the Sacraments of the Dying. Fr^8, fol. 79; Fr^7, fol. 116; Fn^4, no. 87, fol. 43; omitted in Rv^3, Rv^2, and Fp^3.

Impersonated by an Angel.[43] (The last legend of Rv^2 is not found in the other manuscripts of Group II). A widow builds a monastery in honor of the Mother of God and there hears Mass daily, asking Mary to protect her only son. The Virgin miraculously saves him from drowning and his mother permits him to consecrate his life to God in retirement provided that he choose the monastery which she has built. He dies, but the mother is not aware of this inasmuch as she daily hears his voice singing in choir. On her death-bed fourteen years later he appears to her, and she discovers that an angel had taken his place in choir. Rv^2, no. 21, fols. 135-136.

3. TABLE OF CORRESPONDENCE.

The following table shows the relationship between the various manuscripts composing Group II. Indicated on the chart are the legends similar in narrative to the tales in the *Libro del Cavaliere* analyzed in Group III of this study.

	Fr^8	Fr^7	Rv^2	Fn^4	Rv^3	Fp^3	Group III
1 Virgin comes to Devil	1	1	1	94	. .	. .	1
2 Devil as Servant	2	. .	2	68	. .	. .	2
3 Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*	3	. .	3	67	. .	. .	3
4 Mother-in-law and Son-in-law	4	. .	4	93	93	. .	4
5 Unwilling to Deny Mary	5	2	5	69	94	10	5
6 150 *Aves* Daily	6	3	6	70	. .	11	7
7 Hand on the Convent-door	7	4	7	. .	95	. .	. .
8 Pilgrim's Staff	8	5	8	71	. .	13	. .
9 Five Joys	9	6	9	72	96	12	. .
10 Pact with the Devil	10	7	10	73	97	14	9
11 Discord between Husband and Wife	11	8	11	95	98	15	40
12 Severed Hand	12	9	12	88	99	16	41
13 Hospitality	13	10	13	89	100	. .	42
14 Painter	14	11	14	74	. .	17	10
15 Christ-Child and *Ave Maria*	15	12	15	75	. .	18	. .
16 Blasphemer of Lombardy	16	13	. .	76	. .	. .	. .
17 Merchant of Alexandria	17	14	16	77	125	. .	43
18 Bread to the Christ-Child	18	15	. .	78	126	. .	. .
19 Robber Slapped	19	16	. .	96	. .	. .	44
20 The Virgin's Ring of Espousals	20	17	17	97	127	. .	45
21 Nativity of the Virgin	21	18	. .	90	73	. .	46
22 Siege of Chartres	22	19	18	79	74		
23 Blasphemer of Sardinia	23	20	. .	83	75		

---

[41] Johannes Herolt, *op. cit.*, III, p. 54. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, nos. 64 and 117.

[42] Cf. *supra*, Groups I, n. 120 and II, n. 38.

[43] For an abbreviated version cf. Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 30, pp. 54-5; *infra*, Group V, Fp^2, no. 40, and Fr^5, no. 37.

	Fr^8	Fr^7	Rv^2	Fn^4	Rv^3	Fp^3	Group III
24 Eyes Removed	24	21	..	91	..	..	51*A*
25 *Ave Maria* in Letters of Gold	25	22	19	85	76	..	..
26 One Knee	26	23	..	..	77	..	..
27 Ecstasy during *Te Deum*	27	24	..	81	78	..	..
28 Dainties Covered by a Soiled Cloth	28	25	..	80	..	3	53
29 No Death without Confession	29	26	..	82	79	..	18
30 One-eyed Knight	30	27	20	84	107	..	54
31 Incest	31	28	..	92	81	27	55
32 Three Counsels in Humility	32	29	..	86	80	..	..
33 No Death without Confession	33	30	..	87	..	..	..
Impersonated by an Angel	..	..	21	..	..	..	..

As indicated on the chart *Fr*^{7} omits nos. 2, 3, and 4 of *Fr*^{8}, but follows thereafter in perfect sequence. The first fifteen tales in *Rv*^{2} correspond to the first fifteen in *Fr*^{8}. After that the compiler becomes selective, omitting with discrimination and including only one tale (the last in the folios devoted to the *miracoli della Madonna*) not drawn from Group II. Legends 3, 10-18, and 27 in *Fp*^{3} are similar in content but do not always correspond in structure and diction.

The compiler of *Fn*^{4} draws his nos. 67-87 from this series, then goes back for his nos. 88 to 92, finally rescans the group, and inserts for his nos. 93 to 97 those legends which he had at first rejected. Duccio di Gano of Pisa, compiler of *Rv*^{3}, uses Group II for his nos. 73-81, 93-100, 107, 125-127. He is not a mere copyist like the compiler of *Fn*^{4}, but adds details or presents the stories in summarized form.

Group II includes thirteen tales not found in the *Libro del Cavaliere* (Group III), and of those which are in this series, the presence of the legend, 'Eyes Removed,' is indicative of relationship with *Ms* Naples, Bib. Naz. xii.F.25[44] which contains this story. Group II presents the tale, 'Five Joys'; Group III gives the version 'Seven Joys.' The compiler of *Fn*^{4} uses thirty-one of the thirty-three legends in Group II. Later in his compilation he inserts forty-eight[45] of the seventy-five of Group III, carefully omitting those which are alike in narrative in both Groups and which he has already told. In view of these facts the presentation of *Fr*^{8} and *Fr*^{7} in a separate Group (despite Levi's classifying them in the category of the *Libro del Cavaliere*) seems justified.

III. Manuscripts of Mary Legends in Italian: Group III.

1. *LIBRO DEL CAVALIERE* IN RELATED MANUSCRIPTS AND INCUNABULA.

The *Libro del Cavaliere* derives its title from the initial words, "Era uno *cavaliere* molto ricco e potente," of the first legend in its series, 'The Virgin Comes to the Devil instead of His Victim.' Ezio Levi d'Ancona was able to discover only two[46] manuscripts which properly belong to the longer series of the *Libro del Cavaliere*: Naples, Bib. Naz. xii.F.25 and Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220. These prove to be incomplete when one compares their contents with the legends nos. 104 to 152 in *Ms* Florence, Bib. Naz. *Magliabechiano* XXXVIII.70 in which the compiler evidently drew from a longer original manuscript of the *Libro del Cavaliere,* now lost but which gives the series as preserved in incunabula.

---

[44] Cf. *infra*, Group III, 51*A*. The legend, 'Eyes Removed,' is also in *Ms* Padua, Bib. Antoniana 220 but this manuscript does not contain nos. 12 and 28 of Group II.

[45] *Fn*^{4} is incomplete; according to the *tavola* at the beginning of the manuscript it was the original intent of the compiler to include five more, making a total of fifty-three from Group III.

[46] Levi really indicates four: *Mss Fr*^{7}, Fr^8, *N*^{2} and *P*^{1}, cf. *Il libro dei cinquanta miracoli*, p. xcvi, n. 1. In this study we have considered *Mss Fr*^{7} and *Fr*^{8} sufficiently different to treat them in a separate group, cf. *supra*, Group II.

Unfortunately, once the legends appeared in printed form, the manuscripts which were copy for the printer were lost. For a thorough study of the *Libro del Cavaliere* series it is necessary to compare the contents of the few available manuscripts with the more complete incunabula.

It is a striking coincidence that of all the collections of Mary legends Italian printers of the *Quattrocento* and *Cinquecento* chose to reproduce only the *Libro del Cavaliere.*[47] Scholars,[48] who are interested in Mary legends but who have not investigated the manuscripts in Italian, in their reference to Italian variants have been limited to incunabula giving only this series or to nineteenth-century reprints of the same.

Italian incunabula, presenting the series of Marian tales to be considered in Group III, may for the purpose of this study be divided into two types:

A. those which present sixty-one legends,[49] among which are no. 33 ('Dimas and Getas') and no. 51 ('Eyes Removed');

B. those which contain seventy-five tales,[50] omitting nos. 33 and 51 of Incunabulum *A,* and inserting in addition to legends nos. 62-75, three not found in *A.*

2. ANALYSIS OF GROUP III.

Related to the *Libro del Cavaliere* in Incunabulum *A* are these manuscripts:

N^2—Cod. xii.F.25 in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Naples[51] is of the fifteenth century and Venetian in origin. It contains fifty-nine (fols. 171-206) of the sixty-one tales in Incunabulum *A.*

P^1—Cod. 220 in the Biblioteca Antoniana at Padua[52] is a fifteenth-century manuscript and contains only forty-seven legends (fols. 1-69).

Fr^1—Riccardiano 1277[53] is a fifteenth-century manuscript in the Biblioteca Riccardiana at Florence. It contains six Mary legends and the rubrics for a seventh (fols. $136\text{-}145^v$) drawn from the *Libro del Cavaliere.*

N^1—Cod. vii.F.12 in the Biblioteca Nazionale at Naples,[54] also of the fifteenth century, contains one Mary legend (fols. $39^v\text{-}41$) identical in wording with the tale, 'Freed from Prison,' no. 57 in Incunabulum *A*, and in related manuscripts.

---

[47] Levi writes: Tutte le stampe, da quella di Leonardo Achates da Basilea (1475) fino alla milanese nel 1515, riproducono costantemente questa raccolta, la quale nella nostra letteratura constituisce la vera e propria *vulgata* dei *Miracoli.* Cf. *ibid.*, p. xcvi.

[48] Adolph Mussafia, Alessandro d'Ancona, Louis Villecourt, Alfons Hilka etc. merely refer to the *Miracoli della Madonna*, meaning either the Italian incunabula or one of the many reprints available in Europe.

[49] *Li miracoli della gloriosa Vergine Maria*, printed by Bernardino Benali and Matthio da Parma (Venice, 1490), is used in this study as *A.* It is available at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence (E.6.3.120) and corresponds to the reprint of Claudiano Conte Sormani Moretti (Parma, 1841). Before 1490 the number of legends in the incunabula varies from fifty-one to sixty-one or sixty-two. Incunabulum *A* contains sixty-one tales; the actual number given by the printer is sixty-two, but like the compilers of the related manuscripts in Group III he has omitted the sixth tale, 'Infant Speaks,' and then errs in his enumeration.

[50] Inasmuch as P. Misciattelli's reprint of the *Libro del Cavaliere*, originally printed by Ioanne Tacuino da Trino (Venice, 1524), contains only seventy-four legends (omitting the tale, 'Vision of Mary with Sts. Nicholas and Martin'), we have selected as typical of Incunabulum *B*, one for which we have found no reprint: *Miracoli della gloriosa Vergine*, printed by Bartholomaeus de Libris (Florence, 1500). This is available at the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale in Florence. Vatican Library Inc. IV, 106, printed in Florence (1483) is similar.

[51] A. Miola, *Le scritture in volgare dei primi tre secoli della lingua ricercate nei codici della B. N. di Napoli* (Bologna, 1878), p. 335. Cf. Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxviii.

[52] L. Minciotti, *Catalogo dei codici manoscritti esistenti nella Biblioteca di Sant' Antonio di Padova* (Padua, 1842), pp. 71-2; A. M. Josa, *I codici manoscritti della Biblioteca Antoniana di Padova* (Padua, 1886), p. 142. Cf. Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxviii.

[53] S. Morpurgo, *I manoscritti della R. Biblioteca Riccardiana di Firenze* I. 337-8; Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxii. On the protective leaf of parchment at the beginning one reads: A uso di suor Maria Jacobi Iapini in Ripoli. Concerning the activity of the nuns of the convent in Ripoli as copyists, cf. F. Palermo, *I manoscritti Palatini di Firenze* I (Florence, 1853), p. 78.

[54] A. Miola, *op. cit.*, p. 127; Levi, *op. cit.*, p. lxvii.

Similar to Incunabulum *B* is the latter part of the *Ms* Florence, Bib. Naz. *Maglb.* XXXVIII.70, already analyzed in part as Fn^4 in Group II.[55] Legends nos. 104-152 (fols. 48-79) are drawn from the *Libro del Cavaliere* and although the compiler gives the rubrics of nos. 153-156 in the index, he does not complete them.

Duccio di Gano da Pisa, compiler of *Ms* Vatican City, Vat. *Barberiniano lat.* 4032 (Rv^3),[56] also selects from a series of tales, corresponding to Incunabulum *B*, his nos. 41, 55, 57, 59-63, 67-70, and 118-119.

2. The content of each legend in Group III.

1. Virgin Comes to Devil Instead of His Victim.[57] For summary cf. Groups I, 29 and II, 1; Inc. *A*, no. 1; N^2, fol. 171; P^1, fol. 1; Inc. *B*, no. 1.

2. Devil as Servant. Cf. Groups I, 36 and II, 2; Inc. *A*, no. 2; N^2, fol. 172; P^1, fol. 3; Inc. *B*, no. 2; Rv^3, no. 63, fol. 38.

3. Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*. Cf. Groups I, 55 and II, 3; Inc. *A*, no. 3; N^2, fol. 172^v; P^1, fol. 4^v; Inc. *B*, no. 3.

4. Mother-in-Law and Son-in-Law.[58] Cf. Groups I, 54 and II, 4; Inc. *A*, no. 4; N^2, fol. 173; P^1, fol. 5^v; Inc. *B*, no. 4.

5. Unwilling to Deny Mary.[59] Cf. Group II, 5; Inc. *A*, no. 5; N^2, fol. 173^v; P^1, fol. 6^v; Inc. *B*, no. 5.

6. Infant Speaks.[60] The devil disguised as a pilgrim convinces an over-credulous husband that his wife has committed adultery in his absence. He is about to kill her when the baby, not yet a month old, speaks and clears her of the charge. Inc. *B*, no. 6; Fn^4, no. 104, fol. 48.

7. 150 *Aves* Daily. Cf. Group II, 6; Inc. *A*, no. 6;[61] N^2, fol. 174; P^1, fol. 8; Inc. *B*, no. 7; Rv^3, no. 59, fol. 36.

8. Seven Joys.[62] A pious clerk endeavours to console the Mother of God for her grief at the foot of the Cross by commemorating her seven joys. Upon his death-bed he is filled with happiness at the apparition of Mary who gives him a premonition of his eternal joy. Inc. *A*, no. 7; N^2, fol. 174^v; P^1, fol. 8; Inc. *B*, no. 8.

9. Pact With The Devil. Cf. Group II, 10; Inc. *A*, no. 8; N^2, fol. 175; P^1, fol. 9; Inc. *B*, no. 9.

10. Painter. Cf. Group II, 14; Inc. *A*, no. 9; N^2, fol. 175^v; P^1, fol. 11; Inc. *B*, no. 10.

11. The 'Manekine.'[63] The emperor's second wife, jealous of the beauty of her

---

[55] The compiler of Fn^4 will omit legends nos. 1-5 and 7-10 at the beginning of Group III. These correspond to tales in Group II from which he has already drawn. Other omissions in his compilation occur for the same reason. Fn^4 is studied as a whole in Group IV, *infra*.

[56] For nos. 128-87 in Rv^3, cf. *supra*, Group I. It will be observed that in the first part of Rv^3 (cf. *infra*, Group IV) nos. 8, 12, 23, 29 (47), 34, 40 and 45 are legends in the *Libro del Cavaliere*, but they are so abridged or enlarged upon, that it is doubtful if Duccio di Gano used the *Libro* as his source.

[57] Group III, 1-5 correspond to Group II, 1-5. All tales in Inc. *B* may be found in P. Misciattelli's reprint except no. 74, 'Vision of Mary with Sts. Martin and Nicholas.'

[58] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^5, no. 41, fol. 146^v.

[59] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^5, no. 42, fols. 146^v-7.

[60] Cf. P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 6, pp. 15-7.

[61] Cf. *supra*, n. 49 for wrong enumeration in Inc. *A* and related manuscripts.

[62] Alfonso el Sabio, *Cantigas de Santa Maria* I, 3-4, no. 1; Johannes Herolt merely lists the seven joys which the Virgin revealed to a religious, cf. *Promptuarium Discipuli de miraculis beate Marie Virginis*, no. 13, p. 8. For the legend, 'Five Joys,' cf. *supra*, Group I, 31 and n. 57.

[63] Hermann Suchier (ed.), *Les oeuvres poétiques de Phillippe de Remi, Sire de Beaumanoir* I (Paris, 1884-1885), pp. 3-263 and 'La Fille sans main, I-II,' *Romania*, XXX (1901), 519-38; and XXXIX (1910), 61-76. See also the dissertation of Heinrich Daümling, *Studie über den Typus des 'Mädchens ohne Hände'* (Munich, 1912); Margaret Schlauch, *Chaucer's Constance and Accused Queens* (New York, 1927) pp. 30 and 83 ff.; Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 1, pp. 4-9 with bibliographical references on pp. cviii-cx; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 11, p. 269; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 100. 'The Manekine' in Group III corresponds in all details of narrative to the 'Rappresentazione di Stella' in *Sacre Rappresen-*

stepdaughter, contrives to have her killed. The would-be slayers are moved to compassion and merely cut off her hands, leaving her to be a prey to wild beasts. A duke, passing by, rescues her, brings her to his castle, and later gives her to his son in marriage. The stepmother, in the meantime, plans a tournament to distract the disconsolate emperor, and the duke's son comes to joust in the tourney. A message concerning the birth of twin sons never reaches him for it is intercepted by the stepmother who suspects the identity of his wife and forges an answer to the duke, accusing the young girl of adultery and ordering her death. The duke orders his servants to abandon her in a lonely place and this time she finds refuge with a hermit. The Virgin restores her hands and leads her husband to her place of hiding. At the command of the emperor the stepmother is burned at the stake. Inc. *A*, no. 10; N^2, fol. 176; omitted in P^1; Inc. *B*, no. 11; Fn^4, no. 105, fol. 48; Fr^1, no. 1, fol. 136.

12. Mary Assists at Death-Bed.[64] A priest, bringing the Viaticum to a woman at the point of death, finds the Mother of God comforting her in her last hour—a favor she has merited by her devout recitation of 100 *Aves* daily. Inc. *A*, no. 11; N^2, fol. 179^v; P^1, fol. 11^v; Inc. *B*, no. 12; Fn^4, no. 106, fol. 51^v; Rv^3, no. 60, fol. 36^v.

13. Donkey Sold; Harlots Converted; Eyes Removed.[65] A holy man sells his donkey because thoughts of the animal distract him during his prayers. Afterwards in Rouen he converts harlots in a house of prostitution and founds for them a convent. Richard of England falls in love with one of the nuns whose beautiful eyes have attracted him. When he threatens to devastate the convent if she will not yield to his desire, she removes her eyes and offers them to him. The King repents, and her eyes are miraculously restored. Inc. *A*, no. 12; N^2, fol. 180; P^1, fol. 12^v; Fr^1, no. 2, fol. 139^v; Inc. *B*, no. 13; Fn^4, no. 107, fol. 51.

14. Buried Outside the Churchyard.[66] A clerk is killed by his enemies and because of his worldliness is not buried in consecrated ground. His daily prayers to the Mother of God merit that she should appear to a friend of his and request proper burial. A beautiful flower is found in his mouth and his tongue is incorrupt. Inc. *A*, no. 13; N^2, fol. 181^v; P^1, fol. 16^v; Inc. *B*, no. 14; Fn^4, no. 108, fol. 52^v.

15. Sin Concealed in Confession.[67] The niece of an abbess conceals in confession a sin against her vow of chastity. For a year the abbess prays for her and asks Mary to reveal to her the state of her soul. She is shown her niece in hell. Inc. *A*, no. 14; N^2, fol. 182; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 15; Fn^4, no. 109, fol. 52^v.

16. Nun who Returns to Her Convent.[68] A Sister Sacristan is tempted to leave her convent but is unable to find the exit until she removes her habit and

---

tazioni dei secoli XIV, XV, e XVI, ed. A. d'Ancona, III, pp. 317-59.

[64] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 4.

[65] The combination of these three tales is found in Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 5, pp. 15-8, and cxiv-cxix, and *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 26770 (fol. 76), cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 27 (6). The story of the donkey told by Jacques de Vitry is repeated by later writers of *exempla*, cf. Goswin Frenken (ed.), *Die Exempla des Jacob von Vitry*, no. 47, p. 121 with variants listed in note (*loc. cit.*). Levi notes the similarity of the tale of the harlot and the story of the conversion of Thais, *loc.cit.* The legend, 'Eyes Removed,' (cf. Group II, 24) with King Richard (I) of England as protagonist is told by Etienne de Bourbon, *op. cit.*, no. 248, pp. 211-2, and no. 500, p. 431. The oldest version of this legend may be found in the *Vitae patrum* X, 60 (PL 74, 148) and the tale is repeated with William (Rufus) as King in the *De Miraculis* II, 42, of Herbert of Torres, (PL 185, 1352) in the Vendôme collection, cf. *Bulletin de la Société arch. . . . du Vendomois*, XXVI (1887), no. 66, 306-8, and by Odo of Cheriton, cf. L. Hervieux (ed.), *Les fabulistes latins* . . . IV, no. 120, 311. For variants cf. Crane's edition of the *exempla* of Jacques de Vitry, no. lvii, p. 158; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 12, pp. 269-70. Cf. *infra*, Groups III, 51*A* and V, Fn^3, no. 1, and n. 129.

[66] The legend is not localized but otherwise corresponds in detail to the 'Clerk of Chartres.' For variants cf. Pez, no. 3, p. 83; *RR*, II, no. 10, 251; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 5, p. 41; E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 22, pp. 178-9. To their indications add R. Becker, *op. cit.*, no. 3, p. 61; F. Zambrini (ed.), *Dodici conti morali d'anonimo senese* (Scelta di curiosità letterarie, no. 9, Bologna, 1862), no. 4, pp. 17-9.

[67] A similar story occurs in *Mss* British Museum *Additional* 11579 (fol. 117) and *Additional* 27336 (fol. 38^v), cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 530 (34) and 659 (180).

[68] Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 42, pp. 72-4. Cf. *supra*, Group I, 75.

leaves her keys at the feet of a statue of the Virgin, recommending herself to her protection. Once outside the convent, she cannot be constrained to give up her vow of virginity which she has made in Mary's honor, and upon returning, finds the habit and keys as she had left them, the Virgin having performed her duties in her absence. Inc. *A*, no. 15; N^2, fol. 182^v; P^1, omitted; Inc. B, no. 16; Fn^4, no. 110, fol. 53^v.

17. Drowned Monks Sing *Salve Regina.*[69] Two monks drown and while the Office of the Dead is being recited in choir, they revive and sing the antiphon, *Salve Regina.* A youth of marvelous splendor appears and commands St. Bernard and his monks to sing it daily. Inc. *A*, no. 16; N^2, fol. 183^v; P^1, fol. 17^v; Inc. *B*, no. 17; Fn^4, no. 111, fol. 54; Rv^3, no. 55, fol. 35.

18. No Death Without Confession. Cf. Group II, 29;[70] Inc. *A*, no. 17; N^2, fol. 184; P^1, fol. 18; Inc. *B*, no. 18; Fn^4, no. 112, fol. 54^v.

19. Taper Left Behind by an Angel. Cf. Group I, 35;[71] Inc. *A*, no. 18; N^2, fol. 184; P^1, fol. 19; Inc. *B*, no. 19; Fn^4, no. 113, fol. 54^v.

20. No Death Without Confession.[72] In this version a pilgrim on his way to Rome comes upon a beheaded knight, who, because of his custom of fasting on the Vigil of the Feast of the Annunciation for the grace of happy death, is still alive. The pilgrim carries the head to Rome where the knight receives the last Sacraments administered by the Pope and is given proper burial. Inc. *A*, no. 19; N^2, fol. 184^v; P^1, fol. 20; Inc. *B*, no. 20; Fn^4, no. 114, fol. 55.

21. *Salve Regina* During Time of Famine.[73] Monks in a monastery dedicated to Mary are just about to abandon their home because of poverty and famine. Before doing so, they chant the *Salve Regina* and then find that their granary and wine-cellar have been replenished. Inc. *A*, no. 20; N^2, fol. 185; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 21; Fn^4, no. 115, fol. 55^v.

22. Judge Slain in Church.[74] A judge is slain by enemies when paying his customary visit to a Lady-chapel. A priest sees Mary in vision over the main altar and is told that the judge's soul is in heaven and that the church need not be reconsecrated. She gives him as sign a rose which has never faded. Inc. *A*, no. 21; N^2, fol. 185; P^1, fol. 21; Inc. *B*, no. 22; Fn^4, no. 116, fol. 55^v.

23. Accused Unjustly.[75] A devotee of Mary is unjustly accused of theft and murder and condemned to be hanged. His wife, who is grossly insulted by her neighbors, goes to the gallows and finds that he has been sustained for four days. The miracle brings about his liberation. Inc. *A*, no. 22; N^2, fol. 185^v; P^1, fol. 22; Inc. *B*, no. 23; Fn^4, no. 117, fol. 56; Rv^3, no. 61, fol. 37.

24. Girl Named Mary.[76] A knight is about to seduce a girl but dies of remorse when he finds that her name is Mary. The bishop and clergy investigate and find the Virgin watching over the body, around which four candles are burning. Upon each candlestick the first words of the *Ave Maria* are inscribed. The apparition disappears and the knight is given honorable burial. Inc. *A*, no. 23;

---

[69] *Ms Royal* 5 A. viii (fol. 147^v) of the British Museum gives a slightly different version in which the abbot hesitates to bury the two monks in consecrated ground until St. Bernard relates a vision in which he has seen them climbing a hill towards the Virgin and singing the *Salve Regina.* Cf. Ward, *op. cit.,* II, 652 (13). See also Herbert, *op. cit.,* III, 673 (18). For the antiphon cf. H. A. Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus* II (Leipzig, 1844), p. 321.

[70] Unlike no. 29 in Group II. Saturday is not specifically mentioned as the day upon which the knight fasted.

[71] No mention is made of the Feast of the Purification nor of a struggle with an angel to retain the taper as in no. 35 in Group I.

[72] Levi, *op. cit.,* no. 32, pp. 57-8, and cxxxviii.

[73] Cf. *supra,* Group I, 8, and n. 26.

[74] Levi, *op. cit.,* no. 35, pp. 59-60; *infra,* Group IV, 12.

[75] A. Hilka, *op. cit.,* III, 191 and n. 74; A. Meister, *op. cit.,* iii, no. 54, p. 180; *infra,* Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 36. See also E. Galtier, 'Byzantina,' *Romania,* XXIX, 503-5. Compare the version in Group III with 'Thief Sustained' in Group I, 60.

[76] A. Hilka, *op. cit.,* III, 180-1, and n. 61; A. Meister, *op. cit.,* iii, no. 41, pp. 169-70; Villecourt, *op. cit.,* no. 12, p. 43. See also J. Morawski in *Romania,* LXIV 468-70. Cf. *infra,* Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 3.

N^2, fol. 186; P^1, fol. 23^v; Inc. *B*, no. 24; Rv^3, no. 57, fol. 35^v; Fn^4, no. 34, fol. 23.[77]

25. Plegis' Vision of the Christ-Child.[78] Plegis, a priest in Germany, has from his youth an ardent desire to behold Christ. He prays to the Mother of God that such a favor be granted to him. One day after the Consecration of the Mass he is permitted to see and embrace the Christ-Child. Inc. *A*, no. 24; N^2, fol. 186^v; P^1, fol. 25^v; Inc. *B*, no. 25; Fn^4, no. 118, fol. 56^v.

26. Prayers Offered for a Robber's Soul.[79] A robber is killed while kneeling in a secluded place to pray an *Ave*. That night a pious sacristan, entering the Church of St. Peter's in Rome, has a vision of the soul of the robber being tried by Christ and sentenced only to purgatory. The sacristan is then sent by Mary to the Pope to ask for prayers and that the body be buried with honor. The Pope is incredulous but is finally convinced by the roses and lilies which the Virgin sends as a sign. Inc. *A*, no. 25; N^2, fol. 187; P^1, fol. 26^v; Fr^1, no. 3, fol. 141; Inc. *B*, no. 26; Fn^4, no. 119, fol. 57.

27. Priest of One Mass. Cf. Group I, 63; Inc. *A*, no. 26; N^2, fol. 188^v; P^1, fol. 30^v; Inc. *B*, no. 27;[80] Fn^4, no. 120, fol. 58.

28. Delivered from the Devil.[81] A woman troubled by the evil spirit invokes the protection of Mary and is immediately freed from its visitations. Inc. *A*, no. 27; N^2, fol. 189; P^1, fol. 31; Inc. *B*, no. 28; Fn^4, no. 121, fol. 58^v.

29. Monks at their Field Work.[82] A gentleman of refinement enters the Cistercian order and is spared the fasting and hard manual labor. He sees the monks enter chapel after a day of field work and receive from the Virgin a refreshing syrup. Thereafter he shares their labor. Inc. *A*, no. 28; N^2, fol. 189; P^1, fol. 31^v; Inc. *B*, no. 29; Rv^3, no. 67, fol. 40; Fn^4, no. 122, fol. 58^v.

30. Unjust Accusation of Adultery.[83] A knight has a Saracen as servant. When his wife gives birth to a child of very dark complexion, both he and his relatives banish her from his home as an adultress. She begs Mary to work a miracle to prove her innocence, and under the inspiration of grace, throws the child from a high bridge into a river. The child when rescued is unhurt, and very fair and beautiful. Inc. *A*, no. 29; N^2, fol. 189^v; P^1, fol. 33; Inc. *B*, no. 30; Rv^3, no. 70, fol. 41; Fn^4, no. 123, fol. 59.

31. Boy Saved from Drowning.[84] A mother, accompanying her son on a sea voyage, sees him slip off the deck and disappear into the water. Her prayer to the Mother of God is continual, and eight days later when the ship docks, she sees her son standing on the shore. Mary had supported him upon the water and deposited him at the port. Inc. *A*, no. 30; N^2, fol. 190; P^1, fol. 34; Inc. *B*, no. 31; Rv^3, no. 118, fol. 61^v; Fn^4, no. 124; fol. 59^v.

---

[77] Note that the compiler of Fn^4 does not use the *Libro del Cavaliere* as a direct source for his no. 34. For the early part of his manuscript he drew from Rv^3, cf. *infra*, Group IV, 57.

[78] Cf. Paschasius Radbertus, *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*, 14 (PL 120, 1319-20); *Vitae patrum* V (PL 73, 991-2); William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum* III, p. 341. There is a similar version in *Ms* Milan, Bib. Ambrosiana C 150 inf. no. 56 (fol. 28). As in the legend in Group I, 56, the priest wishes to see Christ through devotion; in Group IV, 54, he desires a revelation of the Real Presence to remove his doubts. For variants cf. Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 42, pp. 279-80.

[79] Cf. *Ms* British Museum *Egerton* 1117 (fol. 172^v) described by Ward, *op. cit.*, II, 667 (10). See also Thomas Wright, *A Selection of Latin Stories* (Percy Society, no. 8, London, 1853), no. 145, pp. 130-1, where instead of a rose as a sign, a golden apple is given. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 78.

[80] At this point the chapters of Inc. *B* are misnumbered.

[81] Cf. *supra*, Group I, 58, with n. 92; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 56. Cf. Johannes Bolte in *Alemannia*, XVII, 5, no. 4.

[82] Herbert of Torres, *De Miraculis* I, 1, and III, 14 (PL 185, 1273-5, 1365-6); *Exordium magnum ordinis Cisterciensis* III, 11, and III, 19 (*ibid.*, 1062-3, and 1077-8). See also Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* VII, 107-8: Helinand of Froidmont, *Chronicon* XLIX, (PL 212, 1077); pseudo-Celestine, *Opusculum VI: de miraculis B. M. V.*, cap. xxv (Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum, XXV, Lyons, 1677), p. 817. For variants cf. A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 175-6, n. 56. For the legend of 'Electuary' in which the monk is a physician, cf. *supra*, Group I, *Ma* 80-*Rc* 74, with n. 122.

[83] Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 25, pp. 274-5.

[84] Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 21, p. 43, with variants on pp. cxxxii-cxxxiii.

32. Hermitess Delivered from the Devil.[85] A hermitess, deceived by the devil in the form of a woman, is on the point of leaving her cell to commit sin. She stops to recommend herself to the protection of the Virgin. A mysterious hand prevents her exit, and the devil leaves in noise and confusion. Inc. *A*, no. 31; N^2, fol. 190; P^1, fol. 35; Inc. *B*, no. 32; Rv^3, no. 69, fol. 40^v; Fn^4, no. 125, fol. 59^v.

33. A Leper to Preserve Chastity.[86] A handsome youth is adopted by a nobleman and in the latter's absence finds himself trapped into committing sin by the nobleman's wife. To preserve his chastity he anoints his body with a poisonous herb which gives him a leprous appearance. Upon the nobleman's return he secures permission to retire into a desert where he is immediately cured. Disgusted by the occasions of sin in the world he remains in his place of solitude. Inc. *A*, no. 32; N^2, fol. 190^v; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 33; Fn^4, no. 126, fol. 60.

33*A*. Dimas and Getas. Two robbers, Dimas and Getas, capture a group of travelers among whom are Mary, Joseph, and the Child-Jesus. Dimas asks that the three be given to him as his part of the spoils. His request is granted and he immediately releases them. Mary then asks that the thief be rewarded. Jesus replies that one day when he shall hang on the cross, Dimas will recognize him as the Son of God and will be promised Paradise. Inc. *A*, no. 33; N^2, fol. 191; P^1, omitted.

34*B*. Knight and Squire. Cf. Group I, 16; Inc. *B*, no. 34; Fn^4, no. 127, fol. 60^v.

35. Child Saved from Drowning.[87] In Lombardy a little child is taught to say a prayer to the Mother of God upon passing her picture. One day he falls into the river. He is miraculously saved and attributes his rescue to the Lady of the picture. Inc. *A*, no. 34; N^2, fol. 191^v; P^1, fol. 36^v; Inc. *B*, no. 35; Fn^4, no. 128, fol. 60^v.

36. Theophilus. Cf. Group I, 43; Inc. *A*, no. 35; N^2, fol. 192; P^1, fol. 38^v; Inc. *B*, no. 36; Fn^4, no. 129, fol. 61^v.

37*B*. Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*.[88] Cf. Group III, 3. This tale, found only in Inc. *B*, is substantially the same as no. 3 except that instead of one lily growing from the mouth of the monk, there is found 'un cesto di bianchissimi gigli.'

38. Severed Hand. Cf. Group I, 21; Inc. *A*, no. 36; N^2, fol. 192^v; P^1, fol. 40; Inc. *B*, no. 38; Fn^4, no. 130, fol. 63^v.

39. Judge Saved from Drowning.[89] A judge who has been faithful in reciting the Office of the Blessed Virgin is given up for drowned by his friends. Three days later he presents himself before them and relates that he had called upon Mary and a hand appeared over the water and saved him. Inc. *A*, no. 37; N^2, fol. 193^v; P^1, fol. 42^v; Inc. *B*, no. 39; Fn^4, no. 131, fol. 64.

40. Discord Between Husband and Wife.[90] Cf. Group II, 11; Inc. *A*, no. 38; N^2, fol. 194; P^1, fol. 43^v; Inc. *B*, no. 40.

41. Severed Hand of Bishop of 'Tolleta'.[91] Cf. Group II, 12; Inc. *A*, no. 39; N^2, fol. 194^v; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 41.

42. Hospitality. Cf. Group II, 13; Inc. *A*, no. 40; N^2, fol. 195; P^1, fol. 45; Fr^1, no. 5, fol. 143^v; Inc. *B*, no. 42.

43. Merchant of Alexandria. Cf. Group II, 17; Inc. *A*, no. 41; N^2, fol. 195^v; P^1, fol. 47^v; Inc. *B*, no. 43.

---

[85] Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 18, p. 271. See also *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 9066 (fol. 80^v) as described by Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 261 (89).

[86] See *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 27336 (fol. 69^v), *ibid.*, p. 669 (297).

[87] A similar tale is in the pseudo-Celestine, *op. cit.*, p. 817; in the pseudo-Caesarius. cf. A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, 52, pp. 178-9, and A. Hilka, *op. cit.*, III, 189, no. 72 where the incident occurs *in partibus Lombardiae.* See also Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 29, p. 275.

[88] Cf. P. Misciattelli, *op. cit.*, no. 37, pp. 104-5.

[89] Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 27, p. 275.

[90] It is at this point that the series of tales in Group III resembles the same in Group II; nos. 40-6 in Group III correspond in subject matter to nos. 11-3, 17, 19-21 in Group II. The compiler of Fn^4 omits all legends which he has already drawn from Group II.

[91] Villecourt notes that the doublets, nos. 33 and 41, are also found in the Arabic collections, *op. cit.*, no. 29, p. 50, and no. 54, p. 62.

44. Robber Slapped. Cf. Groups I, 6, and II, 19; Inc. *A*, no. 42; N^2, fol. 196; P^1, fol. 48^v; Inc. *B*, no. 44.

45. The Virgin's Ring of Espousals. Cf. Group II, 20; Inc. *A*, no. 43; N^2, fol. 196; P^1, fol. 49; Inc. *B*, no. 45.

46. Nativity of The Virgin. Cf. Group II, 21; Inc. *A*, no. 44; N^2, fol. 196^v; P^1, fol. 50^v; Inc. *B*, no. 46.

47. Christ-Child Seized as Pledge. Cf. Group I, 34; Inc. *A*, no. 45; N^2, fol. 197; P^1, fol. 51^v; Inc. *B*, no. 47; Fn^4, no. 132, fol. 64^v.

48. Pagan Repaid a Hundredfold.[92] A woman dissuades her pagan husband from lending money on usury, by promising him a hundredfold return if he will give the sum to Christ in the person of the poor at the church door. He becomes indigent but finds a penny in the church and with it buys a fish in which is found a precious stone. He is converted. Inc. *A*, no. 46; N^2, fol. 197^v; P^1, fol. 53; Fr^1, no. 7, fol. 145^v (rubrics only); Inc. *B*, no. 48; Fn^4, no. 133, fol. 65.

49. Chorister.[93] A youth is killed by a Jew for singing the anthem *Alma Redemptoris Mater*. His disconsolate mother hears his voice and traces it to the house of the Jew. The boy is found alive and tells how Mary had placed her hand upon the wound in his throat and restored him to life. The Jew is converted. Inc. *A*, no. 47; N^2, fol. 198^v; P^1, fol. 56; Inc. *B*, no. 49; Fn^4, no. 134, fol. 65^v.

50. Incomplete Garment.[94] A religious youth was wont to say the *Ave Maria* fifty times daily. He increases it to a hundred times a day after seeing Mary with a garment incompletely embroidered with the *Ave* in letters of gold. Some time later she shows him the finished garment and foretells his approaching death. Inc. *A*, no. 48; omitted in N^2 and P^1; Inc. *B*, no. 50; Fn^4, no. 135, fol. 66.

51. Child Saved from Fire.[95] A woman places her little child under Mary's protection while she takes her husband's dinner to him in the fields. Upon her return she finds the house on fire and is just about to lose trust in the Mother of God when she perceives her son in the midst of the flames unhurt. Inc. *A*, no. 49; N^2, fol. 199^v; P^1, fol. 58^v; Inc. *B*, no. 51; Rv^3, no. 119, fol. 62; Fn^4, no. 136, fol. 66^v.

51*A*. Eyes Removed.[97] Cf. Groups II, 24, and III, 13; Inc. *A*, no. 51; N^2, fol. 200; P^1, fol. 60^v.

52. Devil as Cook in a Monastery.[96] The devil offers himself as cook in a monastery where the monks have a great devotion to the Mother of God. During the abbot's absence he sows discord among them. Later he is detected by the abbot and expelled. Inc. *A*, no. 50; N^2, fol. 199^v; P^1, fol. 59; Inc. *B*, no. 52; Fn^4, no. 137, fol. 66^v.

53. Dainties Covered by a Soiled Cloth. Cf. Group II, 28; Inc. *A*, no. 52; N^2, fol. 200^v; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 53.[98]

---

[92] Johannes Moschos, *Pratum spirituale*, cap. clxxxv (PL 74, 214-6); Johannes Monachus, *Liber de miraculis*, no. 15, pp. 63-6; C. Stolfi (ed.), *Corona de' monaci*, no. 53, pp. 133-5. Similar to no. 48 is the tale in *Mss* British Museum *Additional* 18347 (fol. 117^v) and *Additional* 27336 (fol. 5^v) described by Herbett, *op. cit.*, III, 600 (17) and 649 (20).

[93] Carleton Brown lists in his Group C seven versions in which the boy sings *Alma Redemptoris Mater;* in other respects the details of the Italian version correspond to Group A. See 'The Prioress Tale' in W. F. Bryan and Germaine Dempster, *Sources and Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1941), pp. 447-85. For variants, cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 43, pp. 194-5; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 43, p. 28; J. Morawski in *Romania*, LXI, 185-7. Cf. *infra* the curious variants in Group IV, 42.

[94] Cf. *supra*, Group I, *Ma* 82-*Rc* 76.

[95] Johannes Herolt, *op. cit.*, no. 16, p. 9; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 59, p. 285; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 80. Etienne de Bourbon relates a slightly different version, *op. cit.*, no. 123, pp. 105-6.

[96] *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 27336 (fol. 48), a Latin manuscript of Italian origin, contains this version, cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 662 (211).

[97] Cf. Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 12, p. 269 where he refers to Inc. no. 52. Cf. *supra*, notes 49 and 61. Inc. *A* is actually numbered 52 for 'Eyes Removed'; the correct number 51 is given here.

[98] The printer of Inc. *B* numbers this legend 54, although he has skipped 'Eyes Removed' and correctly it should be 53. We are giving the correct enumeration.

54. One-Eyed Judge. Cf. Group II, 30, for the 'One-Eyed Knight'; Inc. *A*, no. 53; N^2, fol. 201; P^1, fol. 62; Inc. *B*, no. 54.

55. Incest. Cf. Group II, 31; Inc. *A*, no. 54; N^2, fol. 201^v; P^1, fol. 63; Inc. *B*, no. 55.

56. Hermit Freed from Impure Temptations.[99] A hermit is advised by a neighboring recluse to say three *Ave Marias* daily to be delivered from temptations against purity. The devil appears and reveals the power of the prayer in this respect. Inc. *A*, no. 55; N^2, omitted; P^1, fol. 64; Inc. *B*, no. 56; Rv^3, no. 68, fol. 40^v; Fn^4, no. 138, fol. 67.

57. Freed from Prison.[100] A count, a devotee of Mary, founds a monastery for an abbot and twelve monks and is persuaded by them to make peace with an enemy. While negotiating peace terms, he is captured and put into prison. He is lamenting that he cannot celebrate a Marian feast day as was his wont, when he finds himself suddenly transported to his own castle. A skeptic, going to the prison, finds the cell locked and empty. He happens to look back as he returns from the castle, and beholds it swallowed up into an abyss. Inc. *A*, no. 56; N^2, fol. 201^v; P^1, omitted; N^1, fols. 39^v-41; Inc. *B*, no. 57; Fn^4, no. 139, fol. 67^v.

58. Deacon Murders His Bishop.[101] An ambitious deacon murders his bishop and succeeds him. At the inaugural banquet one of the guests in vision sees the Mother of God demanding justice. The murderer falls dead. Inc. *A*, no. 57; N^2, fol. 202^v; P^1, omitted; Inc. *B*, no. 58; Fn^4, no. 140, fol. 68

59. Two Devils in Prison. Cf. Group I, 5; Inc. *A*, no. 58; N^2, fol. 203^v; P^1, fols. 65^v-69;[102] Fr^1, no. 6, fol. 144; Inc. *B*, no. 59; Fn^4, no. 141, fol. 69.

60. Pestilence in France.[103] In the time of King Louis a pestilence (*ignis sacer* or *mal des ardens*) takes a toll of one fourth of the population of France. A great multitude of the sick pray in the Cathedral of Notre-Dame in Paris to be delivered from the plague. One night the Virgin Mary appears, blessing the sick, who are immediately cured. Inc. *A*, no. 59; N^2, fol. 204^v; Inc. *B*, no. 60; Fn^4, no. 142, fol. 70.

61. Vision Seen by a Jew.[104] A Jew seized and bound by robbers is released by the Virgin who shows him a vision of heaven and hell. He is baptized and later becomes a monk. Inc. *A*, no. 60; N^2, fol. 205; Inc. *B*, no. 61; Fn^4, no. 143, fol. 70.

62. Abbess: Confidence Betrayed.[105] In this version the abbess is portrayed as a nun of very exemplary life. In a moment of weakness she sins against her vow of chastity. She confides her secret to one of the nuns who betrays her confidence, revealing her condition to an archdeacon. Before episcopal investigation takes

---

[99] Cf. *Ms* British Museum *Harley* 268 (fol. 23^v) described by Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 565 (86).

[100] Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 76 and the slightly different version in Group IV, 104. Usually the knight finds that his chains drop off easily or Mary conducts him from his prison. Legends on this theme are frequent in *Les miracles de Notre-Dame de Roc-Amadour au xii^e siècle* I (ed. Albe), no. 18, p. 105, no. 50, p. 157, no. 53, p. 162, and III, no. 18, pp. 301-2 and in Alfonso el Sabio, *Cantigas de Santa Maria* I, 132-3, no. 83 and II, 230-1, no. 158, 316-7, no. 227; see also Caesarius of Heisterbach, *Dialogus miraculorum* VII, 28, ii, 37-38, the source for Johannes Herolt, *op. cit.*, no. 41; also Jehan le Marchant, *Le livre des miracles de Notre-Dame de Chartres*, no. 24, pp. 142-9.

[101] Etienne de Bourbon, *op. cit.*, no. 46, pp. 54-6. Cf. 'Miracle de l'Evesque que l'Archdiacre murtrit' in *Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages* I (Paris, 1876), pp. 101-46, no. 3. Several manuscripts in the British Museum contain the tale: *Mss Sloane*, 3102 (fol. 63), *Harley* 268 (fol. 18), and *Additional* 18364 (fol. 11^v), cf. Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 97 (46), 564 (64), and 607 (16); also *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 109.

[102] *Ms* P^1 ends its series of Mary legends at this point.

[103] Cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, no. 28, pp. 121-2 and p. 184.

[104] The caption 'Jew of London' is usually given to this legend, but there is no localization in the Italian version. Cf. Vincent of Beauvais, *op. cit.*, VII, 111· Alfonso el Sabio, *op. cit.*, I, 135-8, no. 85; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 30, pp. 275-6; Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 36, pp. 62-4 and p. cxl.

[105] Evelyn Faye Wilson notes that the redaction 'Confidence Betrayed,' seems to have originated in England, *op. cit.*, no. 2, p. 157. See also Levi, *op. cit.*, no. 16, pp. 37-9, and pp. cxxviii-cxxix; F. Zambrini, *op. cit.*, no. 8, pp. 36-51; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 52 and B^1, no. 2.

place, she is delivered by the Virgin Mary. She gains much in the virtue of humility and thereafter lives a life of great sanctity. Inc. *A*, no. 61; N^2, fols. 205^v-206^v;[106] Fr^1, no. 4, fol. 142^v; Inc. *B*, no. 62; Fn^4, no. 144, fol. 70^v.

63. VISION OF JUDGMENT. Cf. Group I, 32; Inc. *B*, no. 63; Fn^4, no. 145, fol. 71.

64. THE VIRGIN'S CHOIR. Cf. Group I, 33; Inc. *B*, no. 64; Fn^4, no. 146, fol. 72.

65. ST. JOHN DAMASCENE. Cf. Group I, 44; Inc. *B*, no. 65; Fn^4, no. 147, fol. 72^v.

66. MONK REVIVED FOR CONFESSION. Cf. Group I, 67; Inc. *B*, no. 66; Fn^4, no. 148, fol. 74^v.

67. *Aves* SEEN AS ROSES.[107] A youth is accustomed to make a garland of twelve flowers for the Virgin Mary. He is persuaded by the abbot, his uncle, to make a spiritual crown of twelve *Aves*. He becomes a monk and is sent to another monastery through a woods infested by robbers. While he halts to say his prayers, the thieves see an angel taking roses from his lips and weaving a crown for the Virgin. He becomes abbot of the monastery and the converted robbers, his subjects. Inc. *B*, no. 67; omitted at this point in Fn^4.[108]

68. O *Intemerata*: BURIED OUTSIDE THE CHURCHYARD.[109] An abbot prevails upon his erring nephew to say daily the prayer, *O intemerata*. Shortly after abandoning the monastery, the nephew dies. A saintly religious reveals to the abbot that the youth's soul is saved and that he should be buried in consecrated ground. As a sign he will find upon his grave a rose on which are the words, *O intemerata*. Inc. *B*, no. 68; Rv^3, no. 62, fol. 37^v; Fn^4, no. 149, fol. 76.

69. THE VIRGIN BARES HER BREAST.[110] A Cistercian monk, because of the strictness of the rule, leaves the Order, becomes a Benedictine, and later the abbot. He is quite lax as a religious but devout to the Virgin Mary. Dying, he is about to be condemned at the judgment by Christ who allows Himself to be influenced when the Mother of God bares her breast and pleads for the salvation of this soul which is allowed to return to the body to do penance. The abbot lives three days, exhorting all to greater devotion to Mary. Inc. *B*, no. 69; Fn^4, no. 150, fol. 77.

70. THE VIRGIN'S WEIGHT ADDED TO THE SCALE.[111] A sinner has a vision of his judgment in which a book of his evil deeds outweighs that of his good actions until Mary to whom he has recourse places herself in the scale. Returning to consciousness, he lives a penitent, devout life thereafter. Inc. *B*, no. 70.[112] Fn^4, no. 151, fol. 78.

71. PIRATE GRANTED THE LAST SACRAMENTS. A pirate, who has never neglected to salute Mary with an *Ave Maria* day and night, is the only one of his band who survives shipwreck. Adrift five days and nights he is about to despair when Mary appears to him and tells him to accept his sufferings in penance for his

---

[106] The Mary legends in both Inc. *A* and N^2 end here.

[107] For variants cf. J. Morawski in *Romania*, LXI, 171-2; Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 19, p. 46. In *Ms* British Museum *Additional* 33956 (fol. 70^v) as in no. 67 an angel takes the roses from the monk's lips, cf. Ward, *op. cit.*, II. 672 (2). Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 41. Infrequently it is the Virgin Mary who culls the roses from his lips. Cf. *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}. No. 118. In the version of Bonavesin da Riva, Mary spreads out her mantle before the monk on horseback, gathering his fervent ejaculations of praise as roses falling from his lips, cf. *Laudes de Virgine Maria*, ed. I. Bekker in *Bericht über die zur Bekanntmachung geeigneten Verhandlungen der Könial. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1850), pp. 489-90, ll. 417-72.

[108] Fn^4, no. 42, fols. 27-8 is taken verbatim from Rv^3, no. 41 and agrees substantially with no. 67. Hence the compiler of Fn^4 does not repeat.

[109] Cf. E. F. Wilson, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 36. Compare no. 68 with the version of Gautier de Coincy, *Les Miracles de la sainte Vierge*, ed. A. E. Poquet (Paris, 1857), pp. 361-70. The prayer, *O intemerata*, which appeared in the twelfth century, has been falsely attributed to St. Anselm (*Oratio*, liii; PL 158, 959). See A. Wilmart, *Auteurs spirituels et textes dévots du moyen âge latin* (Paris, 1932), pp. 481 ff.

[110] The monk does not die but has a vision of his judgment and repents in the Vendôme collection (Isnard, *op. cit.*, no. 29, pp. 122-4) and in the *Cinquanta miracoli* (cf. Levi, no. 29, pp. 81-3). Cf. *Ms* British Museum *Harley* 495 (fol. 59) in Herbert, *op. cit.*, III, 535 (5).

[111] See *Ms* British Museum *Royal* 5 A. viii (fol. 146) described by Ward, *op. cit.*, II. 651 (5); *supra*, Group I, 32; *infra*, Group V, Fr^{10}, no. 82.

[112] The printer of Inc. *B* misnumbers: 69, 71, 73, 74, 75. Correct enumeration is given here.

sins, and that he will have an opportunity to confess. Two days later she orders a monk to go to the seashore, administer the last Sacraments and give the pirate honorable burial. Inc. *B*, no. 71; Fn^4, no. 152, fol. 78^v (incomplete).[113]

72. WIDOW'S VISION OF THE CHRIST-CHILD.[114] A young widow, while contemplating the joy of the Mother of God with the Infant in her arms, is granted the favor of holding and embracing the Christ-Child. Inc. *B*, no. 72; indexed in Fn^4 as no. 153.

73. MILK. Cf. Group I, 11; Inc. *B*, no. 73; indexed in Fn^4 as no. 154.

74. VISION OF MARY WITH STS. MARTIN AND NICHOLAS. Cf. Group I, 12; Inc. *B*, no. 74; indexed in Fn^4 as no. 155.

75. UNWILLING TO DENY MARY.[115] Cf. Group I, 73; Inc. *B*, no. 75; indexed in Fn^4 as no. 156.

3. TABLE OF CORRESPONDENCE.

The following table illustrates the slight difference between the manuscripts related to Incunabulum *A* and the series found in Fn^4 in which the compiler used a manuscript related to Incunabulum *B*.

	Inc.				Inc.			Gp.	
	A	N^2	P^1	Fr^1	*B*	Fr^4	Rv^3	II	N^1
Virgin Comes to Devil	1	1	1	..	1	..	..	1	..
Devil as Servant	2	2	2	..	2	..	63	2	..
Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*	3	3	3	..	3	..	..	3	..
Mother-in-law and Son-in-law	4	4	4	..	4	..	..	4	..
Unwilling to Deny Mary	5	5	5	..	5	..	..	5	..
Infant Speaks	..	..	..	..	6	104	..	..	..
150 *Aves* Daily	6	6	6	..	7	..	59	6	..
Seven Joys	7	7	7	..	8	..	..	..	..
Pact with the Devil	8	8	8	..	9	..	..	10	..
Painter	9	9	9	..	10	..	..	14	..
The 'Manekine'	10	10	.	1	11	105	.	..	..
Mary Assists at Death-bed	11	11	10	..	12	106	60	.	..
Donkey Sold; Harlots Converted; Eyes Removed	12	12	11	2	13	107		..	.
Buried outside the Churchyard	13	13	12	..	14	108		..	.
Sin Concealed in Confession	14	14	..	..	15	109	..	..	..
Nun Who Returns to Her Convent	15	15	..	..	16	110	..	.	.
Drowned Monks Sing *Salve Regina*	16	16	13	..	17	111	55	..	..
No Death without Confession	17	17	14	..	18	112	..	29	.
Taper Left Behind by an Angel	18	18	15	..	19	113	.	..	..
No Death without Confession	19	19	16	..	20	114	.	..	..
Salve Regina during Time of Famine	20	20	..	..	21	115	.	..	.
Judge Slain in Church	21	21	17	..	22	116	..	..	..
Accused Unjustly	22	22	18	..	23	117	61	.	..
Girl Named Mary	23	23	19	..	24	.	57	.	.
Plegis' Vision of the Christ-Child	24	24	20	..	25	118		.	.
Prayers Offered for a Robber's Soul	25	25	21	3	26	119	.	.	..

---

[113] The compiler of Fn^4 begins his no. 152. It is possible that he perceived his repetition, having already inserted the tale as no. 46 in his collection. Cf. *infra*, Group IV, 45. Fols. 79-88 are blank. A similar version, except that the pirate is picked up by a ship in which there are Franciscans, is contained in the *Laudes de Virgine Maria* of Bonavesin da Riva, *loc. cit.*, pp. 483-5, ll. 193-280.

[114] Villecourt, *op. cit.*, no. 48, p. 281. Cf. *supra*, Group II, 15; *infra*, Group IV (Rv^3), 72.

[115] The source is acknowledged: Legesi che è scritto de Cesario . . . Cf. Caesarius of Heisterbach. *Dialogus miraculorum* II. 12, i, 78 ff.; A. Hilka, op. cit., III, no. 103, 217-8, or A. Meister, *op. cit.*, iii, no. 83, pp. 206-7. For further bibliographical references, cf. Group I, n. 109.

	Inc.				Inc.			Gp.	
	A	N^2	P^1	Fr^1	*B*	Fn^4	Rv^3	II	N^1
Priest of One Mass	26	26	22	..	27	120	..	..	..
Delivered from the Devil	27	27	23	.	28	121	..	.	.
Monks at Their Field Work	28	28	24	..	29	122	67	.	
Unjust Accusation of Adultery	29	29	25	.	30	123	70	..	..
Boy Saved from Drowning	30	30	26	.	31	124	118	..	
Hermitess Delivered from the Devil	31	31	27	..	32	125	69	..	
A Leper to Preserve Chastity	32	32	..	.	33	126	..	..	.
Dimas and Getas	33	33	.	.	..	..	..	..	
Knight and Squire	..	..	..	..	34	127	..	..	..
Child Saved from Drowning	34	34	28	..	35	128	.	..	.
Theophilus	35	35	29	..	36	129	..	..	.
Could Learn Only *Ave Maria*	..	..	..	..	37	..	..	.	.
Severed Hand	36	36	30	..	38	130	..	..	
Judge Saved from Drowning	37	37	31	..	39	131	..	..	
Discord between Husband and Wife	38	38	32	..	40	..	..	11	..
Severed Hand of the Bishop of 'Tolleta'	39	39	..	..	41	..	.	12	
Hospitality	40	40	33	5	42	.	..	13	..
Merchant of Alexandria	41	41	34	..	43	..	.	17	.
Robber Slapped	42	42	35	..	44	.	..	19	..
The Virgin's Ring of Espousals	43	43	36	..	45	..	..	20	..
Nativity of the Virgin	44	44	37	..	46	..	..	21	..
Christ-Child Seized as Pledge	45	45	38	..	47	132	..	..	..
Pagan Repaid a Hundredfold	46	46	39	7*	48	133	..	..	
Chorister	47	47	40	..	49	134	..	..	
Incomplete Garment	48	..	..	..	50	135	..	..	
Child Saved from Fire	49	48	41	..	51	136	119	..	.
Devil as Cook in a Monastery	50	49	42	..	52	137	..	..	
Eyes Removed	51	50	43	..	..	..	..	24	..
Dainties Covered by a Soiled Cloth	52	51	..	..	53	..	..	28	..
One-eyed Judge	53	52	44	..	54	..	.	30	..
Incest	54	53	45	..	55	..	..	31	..
Hermit Freed from Impure Temptation	55	..	46	..	56	138	68	..	..
Freed from Prison	56	54	47	..	57	139	..	.	1
Deacon Murders His Bishop	57	55	..	..	58	140	..	..	..
Two Devils in Prison	58	56	48	6	59	141	..	..	.
Pestilence in France	59	57	..	..	60	142	..	..	.
Vision Seen by a Jew	60	58	..	..	61	143	..	..	.
Abbess: Confidence Betrayed	61	59	..	4	62	144	..	..	
Vision of Judgment	..	..	..	..	63	145	..	..	..
The Virgin's Choir	..	..	..	..	64	146	..	..	.
St. John Damascene	..	.		..	65	147	..	..	
Monk Revived for Confession	..	..	..	..	66	148	..	..	..
Aves Seen as Roses	..	..	.	.	67	..	..	.	..
O Intemerata: Buried outside the Churchyard	..		..	..	68	149	62	.	..
The Virgin Bares Her Breast	..	.	..	..	69	150	..	.	.
The Virgin's Weight Added to the Scale	..		..	.	70	151	..	..	.
Pirate Granted the Last Sacraments	..		.	..	71	152†	..	..	..
Widow's Vision of the Christ-Child	..	.	.	.	72	153‡	..	..	..
Milk	..	.	..	..	73	154‡	..	.	.
Vision of Mary with Sts. Martin and Nicholas	..		.	..	74	155‡	..	..	.
Unwilling to Deny Mary	..	..	..	.	75	156‡	..	..	..

* Rubrics only. † incomplete. ‡ indexed only.

It is evident from the analysis of N^2 and P^1 as well as from the chart that the compilers of both collections used a manuscript very similar to the printer's copy for Incunabulum *A*. P^1 omits ten of the legends in N^2 but it is unlikely that its compiler used the Naples manuscript which omits no. 56 contained in P^1.

The compiler of Fn^4 draws forty-eight legends from the longer *Libro del Cavaliere* represented in this study by Incunabulum *B*, and from his index one notes that he intended to use the *Libro* as a source for five more tales. He consistently omits all that he has already drawn from Group II.

Thirteen of the legends in Rv^3 have been included in the study of Group III. Ten more[116] in this collection are on subjects found in the *Libro del Cavaliere* but are so different in wording, although not in content, that it is quite probable that Duccio di Gano used other sources. Many of the legends in Fr^{10} correspond to the same in Group III, but inasmuch as they agree merely in narrative, this agreement is indicated in the footnotes, and Fr^{10} will be considered as a whole in Group V with other miscellaneous manuscripts.[117] Twenty-one of the legends in Incunabulum *B* may be found in the Greek collection of Agapios according to the analysis of Louis Villecourt.[118]

---

[116] Cf. *infra*, Group IV, nos. 8, 12, 23, 29 (47), 34, 40, 41, 45, and 113.

[117] See also *infra*, Group V, Fr^5.

[118] Cf. nos. 9, 11, 12, 18, 23-30, 38, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 49, 55, and 59 in 'La collection grecque d'Agapios,' *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLII (1924), 266-87.

Siger of Brabant's *De Necessitate et Contingentia Causarum* and *Ms* Peterhouse 152

ARMAND MAURER C.S.B.

THE present article continues the study of the commentary on the *Metaphysics* contained in *Ms* 152 of Peterhouse College, Cambridge, begun in *Mediaeval Studies*, 1950.[1] There it was pointed out that this anonymous commentary has the same *Incipit* as Siger of Brabant's. Moreover, like the Paris manuscript of the *Metaphysics* attributed to Siger, it extends from Books II to VII. Preceding Book II are the same eight Questions which form a sort of introduction to the work.[2] The Questions in the commentary, with some exceptions, run parallel to the known Questions of Siger and show a great similarity of treatment and sometimes even literal identity.

In view of this evidence it seems quite probable that the Peterhouse commentary is another redaction of Siger's *Metaphysics*. The question remains whether its contents are throughout in accord with the known thought of Siger. Here it is proposed to edit and study the Question on the necessity and contingency of causes and the related issues of liberty and divine providence. Since it occurs in Book VI, it is not contained in the Munich manuscript of Siger's *Metaphysics*, which extends only to Book V. It appears in a few sentences in the Paris manuscript, but these are too brief to offer much basis of comparison.[3] However, we are fortunate to be able to compare it with the treatise of Siger: *De Necessitate et contingentia causarum*, which deals with the same issues as the Question in the Peterhouse manuscript.

Although a study based on internal criticism such as this is not decisive in settling the question of authenticity, it is at least helpful, and indeed necessary, in the absence of external evidence. We are well aware, however, of the limitations of this method, and we would make our own the warning that *une grande prudence s'impose dans le recours à la critique interne*.[4]

The contents of the Question we are to study fall conveniently into three parts. The first concerns the general notion of the necessity and contingency of causes, the second its application to human liberty, and the third its application to divine providence. We shall consider each of these in turn, comparing it with the doctrine of Siger's *De Necessitate*. Finally, in an appendix, we shall present the text of our Question.

I.

In spite of its obscurity on certain points, the *De Necessitate* presents a coherent view of the causal relationship of God to the universe and of created causes to their effects. It tells us that the First Cause has for its first effect an intelligence which it produces immediately and necessarily. It is the necessary cause of the other intelligences and of the spheres and their movements, not immediately, but through the first created intelligence. The First Cause is also the necessary, although mediate, cause of the determinate positions of the heavenly bodies. Since these bodies move in time, some events in this order are past and some future; but the future events are necessary, not contingent, for their causes cannot be prevented from acting and producing their effects. Future contingent effects are to be found among terrestrial things. The heavenly bodies produce some effects in the lower world as necessary causes, but others as contingent causes, since their action can be impeded. The reign of contingency is even wider in the last order of causes, namely, particular terrestrial causes, which produce their effects sometimes *per se* and necessarily, sometimes *per se* and in the majority of cases, and sometimes *per accidens*.[5]

---

[1] A. Maurer, "Siger of Brabant and an Averroistic Commentary on the *Metaphysics* in Cambridge, *Peterhouse Ms* 152", *Mediaeval Studies* XII (1950), 233-235. The Commentary occupies fols. 51^r-103^v.

[2] The above article mentions that Questions 2 and 5 are missing. Actually they are present, although not designated as distinct Questions in the margin.

[3] *Siger of Brabant, Questions sur la Métaphysique*, ed. C. Graiff (Philosophes Médiévaux I, Louvain, 1948), p. 366, l. (51)—p. 367, l. (69).

[4] F. Van Steenberghen, *Siger de Brabant d'après ses oeuvres inédites* II (Les Philosophes Belges XIII, Louvain, 1942), p. 499.

There are several features in this conception of the universe of causes of special interest to us. It will be noticed, first of all, that Siger adopts the Avicennian view that God creates immediately only one being, the first of the celestial intelligences. He creates everything else through the intermediary of this intelligence. This follows Avicenna's principle: *ex uno secundum quod est unum non est nisi unum;*[6] or as Siger puts it: *ab uno simplici non procedat nisi unum immediate.*[7] It should be noted further that God does not create the first intelligence freely, but necessarily. It was this notion of creation, with its delimitation of God's creative power and its accompanying necessitarianism, that philosophers like William of Auvergne and St. Thomas Aquinas so strongly combatted.[8]

The second point of interest to us here is that Siger, like Avicenna, admits contingent causes, which are defined as those which can be prevented from producing their effects.[9] But he insists that in a sense every effect is necessary with respect to its cause. Siger again quotes Avicenna with approval: *omnis effectus, respectu suae causae, est necessarius.*[10] This statement, however, must be correctly understood. It does not mean, Siger assures us, that some causes are not really contingent, but that if in fact these causes are not prevented from producing their effects they necessarily produce them. Such necessity is not absolute; it is simply the sort of determination which is found in all actually existing being. As Aristotle says, every being must needs be when it is, even though, absolutely speaking, it need not be.[11] So, too, every effect must be when in fact it is produced by a cause which is not impeded.

The Peterhouse manuscript presents us with substantially the same conception of causal necessity and contingency. We find there the same Avicennian hierarchy of causes, arranged according to their grade of necessity. At the peak there are the separate substances, which are absolutely immobile and eternal and hence entirely necessary: *ipsa omnia et secundum quamlibet dispositionem immobilia sunt et aeterna, ideo omnino sunt necessaria.*[12] There is a primary being among them, but its only difference from the others with respect to its necessity is that it has no cause of its necessity whereas they have.

It will be noted that the Peterhouse Question, unlike the *De Necessitate*, does not say that the First Cause, or God, has only one immediate effect. However, the author of that manuscript has already shown this in Book V.[13] Its doctrine on this point exactly parallels that of the Munich and Paris manuscripts of Siger's *Metaphysics.*[14]

---

[5] *De Nec. et cont. causarum*, ed. P. Mandonnet, *Siger de Brabant et l'Averroisme Latin au XIII*ᵉ *Siècle* II (Louvain, 1908), pp. 111-4.

[6] Avicenna, *Metaph.* IX, 4 (Venice, 1508), fol. 104^{vb}.

[7] *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 112.

[8] Cf. William of Auvergne, *De Universo* IaIae, 24-26 (Orleans, 1674), pp. 618-624; IaIIae, 9, pp. 816-817; St. Thomas, *De Potentia* III, 4.

[9] For Siger there is only physical contingency in the universe, in the sense that there are chance occurrences because the causality of some agents can be thwarted. There is no true metaphysical contingency since God does not create freely. Cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* p. 609. The same is true in the universe of Avicenna. Cf. A. M. Goichon, *La Distinction de l'Essence et de l'Existence d'après Ibn Sina* (Paris, 1937), pp. 204-205. An enlightening discussion of necessity in the world of Avicenna will be found in Emil L. Fackenheim, "The Possibility of the Universe in Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina and Maimonides", *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* XVI (1947), 39-70.

[10] *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* pp. 117, 120. Cf. Avicenna, *Metaph.* I, 7, fol. 73^{rb}: Igitur manifestum est quod quidquid possibile est esse non habet esse nisi cum necessarium est respectu suae causae.

[11] Cf. Aristotle, *De Interpretatione* 9, 19*a*22. Quoted in *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 117.

[12] *Infra*, p. 55.

Next in order of necessity come the heavenly bodies, which are immobile and eternal and hence necessary. Even in their movement they have a certain immobility and necessity inasmuch as they always move in the same way.

Among terrestrial things we find some causes which produce their effects always and in the same way. Once these causes are posited, their effect is posited necessarily, for they cannot be prevented from acting. For instance, the composition of contraries in a living thing necessarily is the cause of death. There are other causes, however, which do not necessarily produce their effects for they can be prevented from doing so. For example, the drinking of poison does not necessarily lead to death, for medicine can prevent it. However, death necessarily results from the drinking of poison in the absence of medicine.

From this it is evident that there is always some bond of necessity between cause and effect. The author of our manuscript says that in all cases the proposition of Avicenna is true, namely, that every cause which is disposed to produce its effect, necessarily produces it:

> . . . universaliter vera est propositio Avicennae, scilicet quod omnis causa existens in dispositione in qua nata est producere effectum, de necessitate producit effectum.[15]

However, this does not mean that some causes do not produce their effects contingently. The author of our manuscript rejects this interpretation of Avicenna.[16] It is not true that every effect comes from some cause necessarily, in relation to which its being is necessary.[17] And the reason is that in some cases the cause may be prevented from producing its effect. If the cause can be prevented from producing its effect, it produces it contingently and not necessarily. However, if in fact it is not prevented, it produces it necessarily, for at that moment it cannot be prevented from producing it. This is the kind of necessity with which it is true to say that Socrates must run when he is running, although it is not necessary that he run, or that everything that is must be when it is, although it need not be. The author of the Peterhouse manuscript calls this "conditional necessity", in contrast to the absolute necessity with which non-impedible causes act.[18]

From this we see that the Peterhouse Question and Siger's *De Necessitate* present substantially the same solution of the problem of casual necessity and contingency.

II.

The two works agree not only in their general view on the necessity and contingency of causes, but also in their application of it to the problem of human liberty. They both deny, in almost identical terms, that the will has complete autonomy in its acts. It is not the first cause of its willing; rather it is moved by the judgment of the intellect. And since this judgment, unlike that of the senses, is not determined, neither is the act of the will.

---

[13] Item non potest materia secundum essentiam suam esse effectus immediatus causae primae, quoniam ille effectus est unus utrum (*leg.* tantum), sicut probat Avicenna. Fol. 74^{va}. Fol. 74^{vb} contains the Question: *Quod a Primo non procedat nisi unum immediate* which has been censured in part with heavy strokes of ink in the Munich manuscript. Cf. *Questions sur la Métaphysique, ed. cit.* pp. 302-5.

[14] *Siger de Brabant, Questions sur la Métaphysique, ed. cit.* p. 301, ll. 70-72, (37)-(38).

[15] Cf. *infra,* p. 56. I have not found this proposition literally in Avicenna. It seems to be based on his *Metaphysics* I, 7, fol. 73^{rb}.

[16] Cf. *infra,* p. 56. This is also St. Thomas' interpretation. Cf. his *In VI Metaph.* lect. 3, ed. Cathala-Spiazzi (Rome, 1950), nn. 1192, 1193. It is also Siger's in the Paris manuscript of the *Metaphysics.* Cf. *Siger de Brabant, Questions sur la Métaphysique, ed. cit.* pp. 366, l. (51)-367, l. (69).

[17] Cf. *infra,* p. 60.

[18] Cf. *infra,* p. 57.

Accordingly, the freedom of the will consists in the fact that, although it is moved by other causes, the nature of the will is such that they can always be prevented from moving it. However, the will is under the same bond of necessity as other contingent causes. We have seen that when these causes are in fact not prevented from acting, they necessarily produce their effects. So, too, in the case of the will. When it is disposed to act and the causes which move it are disposed to do so, the will cannot not will. It was this doctrine, with its suggestion of determinism, that was censured by Stephen Tempier in his condemnation of 1277.[19]

There is such a remarkable similarity in the statement of the freedom of the will in the two works that it will be well to place them side by side for comparison.

De Necessitate[20]	*Ms* Peterhouse 152[21]
Circa quod considerandum quod libertas voluntatis in suis operibus non sic est intelligenda, quod voluntas ipsa sit prima causa sui velle et sui operari, potens se movere ad opposita ab aliquo priori non mota. Voluntas enim non movetur ad volendum nisi ex aliqua apprehensione. Non est hoc etiam libertas voluntatis quod ipsa voluntate existente in dispositione illa in qua nata est moveri ad volendum, et movente etiam existente in dispositione[m] in qua natum est movere, possit aliquando non moveri voluntas, vel hanc potentiam ut non moveatur sic disposita, et agente sic disposito. Hoc enim est impossibile. Sed in hoc consistit libertas voluntatis quod etsi ab aliquibus inveniatur aliquando moveri, cum huiusmodi moventia non sint impedita, tamen talis est natura voluntatis quod quodlibet eorum quae nata sunt movere voluntatem potest a suo motu impediri, quia voluntas vult ex iudicio rationis, quae se habet ad opposita. Sed appetitus sensitivus ex iudicio sensus.	Non enim voluntas sic libera est quod sit causa prima sui velle; immo necesse est eam moveri ex aliqua apprehensione. Nec est sic libera pro praesente volito ipsi voluntati, et ipsis existentibus in dispositione in qua hoc quidem natum sit movere, illud autem moveri, possit voluntas velle vel non velle indifferenter; immo necesse est eam velle ut sic existentem. Sed est voluntas libera quantum ad hoc quod ipsa a nullo potest moveri quod non sit impedibile et etiam quandoque actu impeditum. Sic tamen non est de judicio sensibilium. Visus enim apprehendens album non potest judicare non album, et hoc si fuerit sensatio albi, ut in quarto habitum est.

We find the same explanation of the freedom of the will in Siger's *Impossibilia*.[22] There he says that in a sense human actions are necessitated, not in that they are forced or that the will is moved by a cause that cannot be impeded, but in the sense that every effect with respect to its cause is necessary *ex conditione*, that is, if that cause is not impeded.

---

[19] The condemned proposition 131 reads: Quod voluntate existente in tali dispositione in qua nata est moveri, et (movente) manente sic disposito quod natum est movere, impossibile est voluntatem non velle. *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* I, ed. H. Denifle and A. Chatelain (Paris, 1889), p. 551. Cf. Dom O. Lottin, *Psychologie et Morale aux XIIe et XIIIe Siècles* I (Louvain, 1942), pp. 278-80. For Siger's doctrine of the freedom of the will, cf. pp. 262-71. Unfortunately the author does not distinguish between the authentic and doubtful works of Siger.

[20] *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 118.

[21] Cf. *infra,* p. 59.

[22] *Impossibilia,* ed. P. Mandonnet, *op. cit.* pp. 89-90.

In the Peterhouse manuscript one of the arguments to prove that every effect does not occur necessarily is that this would destroy freedom of choice and the duty of punishing bad acts, and it would likewise turn men away from good deeds. All these, the author continues, are contrary to the Catholic Faith and also to Aristotle's intention:

> Omnes effectus de necessitate evenire tollit arbitrii libertatem, tollet punitiones actuum malorum debere fieri, retrahit etiam ab actibus bonis. Quod si haec omnia Catholicae Fidei contradicunt, et cum hoc intentioni Aristotelis, non est ponendum omnia de necessitate evenire.[23]

The *De Necessitate* also argues that to say all things happen of necessity destroys freedom of choice.[24] The treatise, however, shows no concern with the agreement of philosophy with the Faith. It maintains the strict separation of religion and philosophy associated with the name of Siger of Brabant. But it is not unknown for him, especially in his later works, to show an interest in the reconciliation of philosophy and the Faith. For example, in his Questions on the *Metaphysics* he says that Avicenna, Aristotle, the Faith and Proclus all maintain that there is one efficient cause of all things: *intelligendum quod Avicenna, Aristoteles, fides et Proclus volunt quod una sit causa effectiva omnium.*[25] Thus the linking of the Faith and the philosophers on the question of free will does not argue against the authenticity of the Peterhouse manuscript.

III.

The only serious difference between the two works is in their views on divine providence.[26] They agree that God exercises a providence over the universe in virtue of His primary and universal causality.[27] They are likewise in agreement that providence, even though infallible, does not impose necessity on all things. And their explanation of this is substantially the same. Providence is carried out through secondary causes, some of which can be prevented from acting. Providence, then, does not impose necessity on all future effects any more than does the whole order of causes through which it is carried out.[28] The *De Necessitate* defines providence as the practical understanding of the connection or relation of causes to their effects.[29] Now this relation or connection does not impose necessity on all future effects, but only on those resulting from causes that cannot be impeded. Consequently, neither does the understanding of the order of causes impose necessity on things.

It might seem that we can speak of the contingency of future events only in relation to secondary causes and not in relation to providence and the whole connection of causes. With regard to the latter, all things would seem to be absolutely necessary. Both works, however, reject this view.[30] The only kind of necessity binding all future effects to their causes and to the whole order of causes is conditional necessity. In other words, in the whole order of causes there is always a determinate cause for every effect which in fact is not impeded and actually occurs. In this sense, the Peterhouse Question says, every future effect can be said to be determined through divine providence, since it can be traced back to the First Cause, either immediately or mediately, through a series of causes which determine it. It is this kind of determination or necessity in things that corresponds to the infallibility of divine providence.[31]

---

[23] *Infra*, p. 55. Cf. pp. 57, 59.

[24] *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 118.

[25] *Questions sur la Métaphysique* III, 7, *ed. cit.* p. 95, ll. 52-3. Cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* p. 682. The parallel passage in the Peterhouse Questions omits the Faith from this curious line-up: Item verum est quod Aristoteles et Avicenna et Proclus et omnes fere Peripatetici dicunt quod tantum est una causa effectiva omnium. Fol. 58^{rab}.

[26] For Siger's notion of providence, cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* pp. 606-7.

[27] Cf. *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 122; *infra*, p. 58.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.*

[30] Cf. *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* pp. 121-2; *infra*, p. 58.

So far our two works are in essential agreement. They differ, however, in treating the question of God's providence and foreknowledge of future contingents. In the *De Necessitate* Siger reminds us that God does not know His effects in themselves but in His own substance. It follows that His knowledge of these effects is identical with His knowledge of Himself, which is always infallible and true. It cannot, then, extend to future contingents, since, according to Aristotle, a future contingent is neither true nor false. For example, it is neither true that a naval battle will take place nor that it will not take place, although it is true that it will either take place or not take place. It follows that God's knowledge, which is always true, does not include future contingents.[32]

Siger realizes, however, that this will sound offensive to some ears, and so he proposes another explanation. God can have infallible providence and knowledge of all things, even future contingents, because He does not know them in themselves but in His own immutable self. Just as He knows mutable things with an immutable knowledge, so also does He have infallible providence and foreknowledge of fallible future events.[33]

Unfortunately, Siger's thought is not very clear at this point. The text of the *De Necessitate* is somewhat obscure in its present edition, and Siger himself does not explain his views as fully as one would wish. However, he undoubtedly thought that God's foreknowledge of contingent effects could be denied, and this denial implies of course the denial of divine providence over them. Having assured us of it once, he returns to the same point a little later on: *Posset negari antecedens quo dicitur quod provisum est quod a fiet, sicut dictum est prius.*[34] It is significant, in this regard, that he does not attempt to answer the argument, based on the notion of the truth of future contingents, which led to this denial.

In his second explanation, however, Siger admits God's foreknowledge of future contingents and by implication divine providence over them, but it is difficult to know in what sense this is to be understood. Is he simply stating the same position in different words so that it will sound less offensive to pious ears? Or does he mean, like St. Thomas, that in knowing Himself, God knows future contingents not only *in causa* but also as they are in themselves as eternally present to Him?[35] It is hard to say from Siger's brief account.

Turning now to the Peterhouse Question, we see that there is no suggestion that God lacks foreknowledge of future contingents. It states without reserve that He foreknows both the contingent and necessary future: *Praescientia autem Dei est et futurorum contingentium et necessariorum.*[36] It warns us against the anthropomorphism of conceiving God's foreknowledge on the model of our own. We can foresee only what will necessarily happen, whereas God, who sees all things as present, has foreknowledge of future contingent effects as well as of those that occur necessarily.[37]

In the light of this comparison what can be said about the authorship of the Peterhouse manuscript? On the whole it treats the question of the necessity and contingency of causes in much the same way as the *De Necessitate*. Even the examples used and the authorities quoted are generally identical. The difference in handling the problem of divine foreknowledge is a serious one; but we must remember that in the *De Necessitate* Siger offers two possible solutions, the second of which is easily reconcilable with that of the Peterhouse manuscript. Moreover, he shows dissatisfaction with the first solution, or at least with the formula in which it is expressed. He is clearly looking for one that will sound less offensive. This may explain why he omitted it in his Questions on the *Metaphysics*, which seem to postdate the *De Necessitate*.[38] What is more we cannot rule out the possibility that Siger modified his views in the course of his career. Although most of the evidence that he did so is based on works which are of doubtful authenticity, some is found in those that definitely are authentic.[39] For instance, the Lisbon *Quaestiones naturales* throw doubt on the Avicennian principle that the First Cause has only one immediate effect—a doctrine accepted in the Questions on the *Metaphysics*.[40] If the Peterhouse Questions are Siger's, they are another witness to his critical examination of his earlier doctrines. However, it remains only probable that the Questions in their entirety are his. This is as much as can be said until a complete study of them is made.

---

[31] Cf. *infra*, p. 60; *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 117.

[32] *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* p. 123.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] *Op. cit.* p. 124.

[35] Cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Theologiae* I, 14, 13.

[36] *Infra*, p. 60.

[37] *Ibid.*

APPENDIX[1]

<UTRUM OMNIA DE NECESSITATE EVENIANT>

Et ideo hic quaeritur utrum omnia de necessitate eveniant, sic quod quaecumque sunt vel fuerunt necessario futura essent, et quaecumque futura sunt necessario evenient.

[1] Et quod sic videtur, quia omnis effectus necessario evenit ab aliqua causa respectu cujus esse suum est necessarium, secundum Avicennam.[2] Et visum est superius quod quamvis aliqua causa possit impediri a productione effectus, a causa tamen existente sub tali dispositione, scilicet quod non sit impedita, de necessitate provenit effectus. Et causa illa, ut sub tali dispositione existens, est effectus alicujus causae respectu cujus est necessarium suum esse, et illa adhuc alterius, et sic usque ad causam primam. Quod sit causa prima de necessitate, sic ex connexione causarum sequitur quod omnia de necessitate eveniunt.

Et declaratur ratio, quia si non omnia de necessitate eveniant, hoc est quia aliquorum sunt causae ut in pluribus quae nata sunt impediri. Sed adhuc causae illae, existentes sub tali dispositione quod non impeditae, de necessitate producunt effectum. Et illae causae, existentes sub tali dispositione, effectus sunt alicujus alterius causae quae, existens sub tali dispositione quod non (92*vb*) impedita, de necessitate producit effectum. Et illius causae est accipere aliam causam, et sic semper quousque deveniatur ad causam primam quae, cum de necessitate sit, et omnes effectus de necessitate evenient.

[2] Item. Sit *B* aliquis effectus futurus. *B* igitur in praesentibus habet causam. Aut igitur habet cum impedimento aut sine. Si cum impedimento, tunc non erit; positum autem est ipsum fore. Si sine impedimento, tunc arguitur: Omnis effectus qui fiet in praesentibus habens causam non impeditam, de necessitate fiet. *B* autem effectus est talis. Ergo *B* de necessitate fiet. Et sic arguetur de quocumque effectu futuro.

[3] Item per Aristotelem hic.[3] Quando alicujus effectus futuri praesens est aliqua causa quae non est nata recipere impedimentum, effectus ille de necessitate eveniet, ut quia istud vivum compositum est ex contrariis de necessitate morietur. Nunc autem omnis effectus futurus in praesentibus habet causam quae non nata est recipere impedimentum, scilicet providentiam divinam. Omnes enim effectus a Deo provisi sunt, et non potest a sua providentia frustrari, tum quia

---

[38] Cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* pp. 560, 564.

[39] On the question of the authenticity of the works of Siger, cf. F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* pp. 499-536; E. Gilson, *Compte Rendu* of the preceding work, *Bulletin Thomiste* VI (1940-42), 5-22.

[40] Cf. F. Stegmüller, "Neugefundene Quaestionen des Siger von Brabant". *Recherches de Théologie Anc. et Méd.* (1931), 182. Cf. also F. Van Steenberghen, *op. cit.* pp. 611-2.

[1] *Quaestiones in libros Metaphysicae*, Peterhouse *Ms* 152, fol. 92^{va}.

[2] *Metaph.* I, 7 (Venice, 1508), fol. 73^{rb}.

[3] *Metaph.* VI, 3, 1027b7-10.

nihil ei accidit, tum quia causa quae subjacet impedimentis non est totum ordinans; ipse autem est totum ordinans. Quare, etc.

[4] Item. Hic apparet auctoritate Boethii libro *De Consolatione*.[4] Dicit enim quod fatum "ab immobilis providentiae proficiscens exordiis, actus fortunasque hominum indissolubili causarum connexione constringit". Unde secundum ipsum ipsa connexio causarum in entibus explet providentiam divinam. Et cum providentia divina falli non possit, nec ipsa connexio causarum falli poterit.

[5] Item. Hoc idem arguitur ex providentia divina. Sequitur enim, supposito quod *A* sit aliquis effectus futurus et praescitus sit a Deo, si *A* est praescitum de necessitate eveniet. Quandocumque enim in aliquo conditionali antecedens necessarium est et consequentia necessaria, consequens erit necessaria. Sic autem est in proposito. Quare, etc.

Oppositum vult hic Commentator.[5] Dicit enim quod omnia esse talia quod necessarium esset ea fore antequam fierent contra sensum est et intellectum. Nec est sicut in exemplis legalibus dictum est, quod omnia scripta sunt in tabula, et quaecumque scripta sunt ibi necesse est venire ad actum.[6]

Item. Hoc idem vult Aristoteles hic.[7] Dicit enim quod quamvis iste necessario moriturus sit quia compositus est ex contrariis, non tamen est aliquid factum praesentialiter quo moriturus sit necessario violentia vel infirmitate,[8] ut si iste nunc comedit mordicantia quae sint causa sitis. Sitis autem sit causa exitus a domo, et exitus a domo sit causa quod occurrat[9] latronibus et ab eis interficiatur. Vel si exitus a domo sit causa quod intret aestum et febricitet et modo moriatur. Est intentio Aristotelis hic quod quamvis ita contingat, non tamen ex hoc quod nunc comedit mordicantia de necessitate sit vel sic morietur. Tunc enim quandocumque contingeret haec causa, de necessitate eveniret effectus; quod non est verum.

Item. Hoc idem intendit Aristoteles in fine primi *Perihermenias*.[10] Vult enim quod in contingentibus in altera parte contradictionis de futuro non est veritas; ut non est verum dicere quod navale bellum erit cras, vel quod navale bellum non erit (93*ra*) cras. Sed navale bellum fore cras vel non fore cras est verum. Qualitercumque autem necessarium esset navale bellum fore cras, sive ex causa sua particulari non impedita, sive ex connexione omnium causarum in entibus, dum tamen necessarium esset veritas in ista parte determinate: navale bellum erit cras. Quia si Aristoteles hoc non concludat, certum est de intentione sua esse quod effectus contingentes futuri, nec per comparationem ad suas causas particulares, nec per comparationem ad totam connexionem causarum in entibus, necessario eveniant.

Item. Omnes effectus de necessitate evenire tollit arbitrii libertatem, tollet punitiones actuum malorum debere fieri, retrahit etiam ab actibus bonis. Quod si haec omnia Catholicae Fidei contradicunt, et cum hoc intentioni Aristotelis, non est ponendum omnia de necessitate evenire.

Ad hoc primo intelligendum est quod necessitas est impossiblitas quaedam aliter se habendi. Hoc autem est immobilitas quaedam; immobilitas autem est aeternitas quaedam. Et ideo sicut aliquid est immobile et aeternum, ita est necessarium, et e converso.

Necessitas autem diversimode reperitur in diversis. Primo enim invenitur in separatis. Unde quia ipsa omnia et secundum quamlibet dispositionem immobilia sunt et aeterna, ideo omnino sunt necessaria; tamen in eis est aliquid primo necessarium, non habens causam suae necessitatis, cujusmodi est ens primum. Aliae autem substantiae separatae ab ipso habent causam suae necessitatis.

---

[4] IV, Prosa 6, n. 19; CSEL 67, 98, ll. 11-14.

[5] Averroes, *In VI Metaph.* t. c. 7 (Venice, 1574), fol. 151BC.

[6] Cf. Averroes, *op. cit.* fol. 151C; also Siger of Brabant, *De Nec. et cont. causarum, ed. cit.* pp. 122-3.

[7] *Metaph.* VI, 3, 1027b1-11.

[8] *Ms* utilitate.

[9] Occurrat in margin, partially illegible on microfilm. Cf. St. Thomas, *In VI Metaph.* lect. 3, ed. Cathala-Spiazzi (Rome, 1950), n. 1197.

[10] 9, 19a22-19b4.

Consequenter autem caelestia corpora, quia quantum ad substantias suas immobilia sunt et aeterna, ideo ut sic sunt necessaria. In motu tamen earum invenitur immobilitas quaedam et impossibilitas aliter se habendi, inquantum semper eodem modo moventur.

Consequenter autem in istis inferioribus inveniuntur quaedam causae quae semper effectum suum producunt et semper eodem modo operantur; et haec immobilitas in eis est inquantum ipsis positis necessario ponitur effectus, ut natae sunt <non> impediri ab effectu, ut viventem fore moriturum necessario. In vivente enim est causa, scilicet compositio ex contrariis, quae immobilis est et impossibilis aliter se habere, ad hoc quod producat effectum, scilicet mortem.

Consequenter in his inferioribus inveniuntur aliae causae quae secundum se acceptae mobiles sunt ad hoc quod producant effectum, et possibiles aliter se habere. Ipsae tamen acceptae ut sub defectu impedimenti immobiliter effectum producunt, ut quamvis ex comestione veneni non de necessitate sequitur mors, tamen ex comestione veneni ut accepta cum absentia medicamenti de necessitate sequitur mors. Et ita causa ista quamdam immobilitatem et etiam quamdam necessitatem habet ad effectum; propter quod universaliter vera est propositio Avicennae,[11] scilicet quod omnis causa existens in dispositione in qua nata est producere effectum, de necessitate producit effectum.

Hoc autem intendit Aristoteles,[12] scilicet per hoc quod quando movens est in dispositione in qua nata est movere, et mobile in dispositione in qua natum est moveri, oportet hoc movere, illud autem moveri; immo nisi ita esset, agentia ut in pluribus numquam producerent suos effectus.

His sumptis, dico ad quaestionem quod referendo aliquem effectum futurum ad causam ut in pluribus, sive secundum se et abstracte acceptum, sive sub privatione impedimenti acceptum, non est necessarium (93*rb*) fore effectum ejus. Ostensum enim est quod necessarium esse est immobile esse et impossibile aliter se habere.

Item. Aliquid quod non movetur quia non est praesens movens non ideo immobile est; quoniam si solum [im]mobile esset quando esset praesens movens, cum tunc actu moveatur, tunc solum mobile esset cum actu moveretur; et ita non esset ponere aliquam potentiam nisi actui conjunctam, sicut Megarici posuerunt, quos reprobat Aristoteles in nono hujus.[13]

Ex quo arguo sic: Effectus non provenit necessario ex causa sua nisi cum causa immobilis est ad effectum. Sed causa ut in pluribus accepta ut sub defectu impedimenti, quamvis non impediatur, non tamen est immobilis illo motu. Quod enim aliquid non moveatur propter absentiam moventis, hoc non dat ei rationem immobilis. Quod igitur evenit a causa ut in pluribus accepta ut sub defectu impedimenti non provenit ab eo necessario.

Sed istud videtur repugnare praedictis. Nam dictum est quod causa ut in pluribus accepta ut sub absentia impedimenti semper producit effectum. Sempiternitas autem quaedam immobilitas est et necessitas. Est igitur quaedam immobilitas hujusmodi causae non impeditae ad effectum.

Dico ad hoc quod ex ista immobilitate hujusmodi causae ad effectum non dicimus absolute quod effectus ejus necessario futurus est, sed quod necessario futurum est contingenter; nec est oppositio in adjecto, quia contingentia hic accepta non opponitur necessitati hic acceptae. Necessitas enim quae consistit in hoc quod causa non impedita semper producit effectum, ex hoc est quod semper effectus sic provenit ex causa sic se habente. Contingentia autem in hoc consistit, quod causa ista sic se habens semper impedibilis est. Ex hoc enim quod non impedita propter privationem impedientis non habet rationem non impedibilis, sicut mobile propter privationem moventis non habet rationem immobilis.

---

[11] I have not found this proposition in Avicenna. It is found *ad sensum* in his *Metaphysics* I, 7, fol. 73^{rb}. Cf. Algazel, *Metaphysics* I, 7, ed. J. Muckle (Toronto, 1933), p. 45, l. 26- p. 46, l. 5.

[12] *Metaph.* VI, 3, 1027a29-1027b16.

[13] *Metaph.* IX, 3, 1046b28-31.

Item. Quamvis ex causa non impedita proveniet effectus, ex causa tamen non impedita non de necessitate provenit effectus, sicut dicit Aristoteles fine primi *Perihermenias,*[14] quod omne quod est, quando est, necesse est esse; non tamen omne quod est necesse est esse.

Ex his igitur patet quod valde refert dicere effectum aliquem evenire a causa non impedibili et a causa non impedita. Si etiam utrobique sit immobilitas et necessitas quaedam causae ad effectum, multum refert haec et illa. Nam una est necessitas absoluta, alia autem conditionata. Unde si omnes effectus provenirent a causis non impedibilibus, tolleretur libertas arbitrii et punitiones malorum actuum, et nihil valeret auxiliari neque negotiari effectus; tamen [non] evenire a causis non impeditis non tollit aliquod istorum. Quamvis enim aliquotiens ex comestione veneni non impedita inducta sit mors, non propter hoc dimittit medicus consiliari, ut apponat medicamentum contra comestionem veneni. Quamvis enim ipsa quando non impedita est necessario inducat mortem, est tamen impedibilis; et ideo alia est necessitas causae non impedibilis ad suum effectum et causae non impeditae ad suum effectum.

Unde propter indistinctionem hujus necessitatis ad illam diversos incidere in diversos errores. Quidam[15] enim credentes omnium causarum ad suos effectus esse consimilem necessitatem, ne viderentur tollere libertatem arbitrii et alia superius enumerata, negaverunt hanc (93*va*) propositionem: causa existens in dispositione in qua nata est effectum producere, de necessitate producit; quae tamen manifestissime vera est.

Alii[16] autem propositionem istam credentes, cum hoc quod non distinguebant inter necessitates causarum ad effectus, in hanc haeresim incederunt, quod negabant libertatem arbitrii et punitiones malorum actuum, penitus retrahentes se ab actibus bonis, quia dicebant in praesentibus determinatum esse si deberent damnari vel non.

Ad ampliorem autem veritatis manifestationem circa praedictum axioma difficile, sex distincte consideranda sunt.

Primum est quod si attendamus ad causas effectuum futurorum, invenimus quaedam a causis suis procedere tripliciter. Quaedam enim procedunt a causa necessaria simpliciter, in cujus natura non est reperire impedimentum, ut viventem fore moriturum. Alia autem procedunt a causis ut in pluribus, quibus positis, non semper ponitur effectus, quia causae in natura sua natae sunt recipere impedimentum, sicut comestio veneni est causa mortis. Alia autem sunt quae nec procedunt ab hac causa nec ab illa, sed solum a causa per accidens, ut quod agens contrarium potentius existens faciat deficere agens ut in pluribus ab effectu intento. Hoc quidem facit non per se sed per accidens, inquantum accidit in dispositionem materiae quam causat occurrere agenti ut in pluribus. Isto triplici modo quicumque effectus futuri a causa tali vel tali procedunt.

Secundo considerandum est unum commune omnibus istis causis, scilicet quod quaelibet istarum causarum existens in dispositione in qua nata est effectum producere, alias quandocumque ponitur in illa dispositione, necessario producit effectum, ut causa ut in pluribus cum non est impedita quamvis in potentia sit ad hoc quod non producat effectum eo quod impedibilis est, ipsa tamen non impedita non est in potentia ad hoc quod non producat effectum cum non impedita est. Sic dicit Aristoteles primo *Caeli et Mundi,*[17] quod sedens, cum sedet, habet potentiam ad ambulandum; non tamen habet potentiam ad ambulandum cum sedet. Est autem praedicta propositio intantum vera quod qui eam negaret necessario concedet aliquem effectum procedere a non sua causa vel causam propriam in actu existere sine suo effectu. Procedat enim aliquis effectus a causa ut in pluribus existente sub defectu impedimenti, aut ipsa sub ista dispositione existens est causa in actu propria hujus effectus aut non. Si non, tunc iste procedit a non causa sua. Si sic, tunc nisi alias posita causa ista sub eadem dispositione ponatur, idem effectus erit causa in actu propria et sufficiens sine suo effectu.

---

[14] 9, 19*a*23.

[15] Cf. the proposition condemned by Stephen Tempier in 1277, n. 131, quoted *supra*, note 19.

[16] Probably Gottschalk and the predestinationists. Cf. Hincmar, *De Predestinatione dei et libero arbitrio*, especially ch. 15, PL 125, 126 ff; ch. 21, 182 ff; Rabanus Maurus, *Epistola V*, PL 112, 1531B; *VI*, 1554BC.

[17] I, 12, 281*b*16-17.

Tertio considerandum est quod tria sunt quae eadem via artant effectus futuros ad eventum; quorum duo sunt providentia divina et connexio causarum seu habitudo omnium praesentium. Et quod ista duo eodem modo artent apparet, quia causa prima ex providentia sua causa universalis est et prima. Ergo effectus suos non producit nisi per causas secundas. Si igitur connexio causarum suarum non artet effectus futuros ad eventum necessarium, nec providentia divina ad hoc artabit. Tertium autem quod consimiliter istis artat effectus futuros (93*vb*) ad eventum quod omnis effectus qui fiet aut in praesentibus habet causam non impedibilem, aut causam ut in pluribus impedibilem non impedita tamen, aut causam per accidens sub dispositione illa in qua habet causare effectum, et hoc vel immediate vel per media plura vel pauciora.

Quarto considerandum est quod causa quae nata est recipere impedimentum secundum se accepta non habet unde actu producat effectum, quoniam si sic, alias quandocumque poneretur necessario produceret effectum, et non esset causa impedibilis. Sed causa ista, ex hoc quod non impedita, habet unde actu causet effectum suum; non quia remotio impedimenti det ei naturam per quam actu sit causa, sed quia est remotio alicujus quod prohiberet naturam secundum quam ipsa est causa sui ipsius. Idem intelligendum est de causa per accidens.

Quinto considerandum est quod in praesentibus est causa in actu cujuslibet futuri quod eveniet, vel immediate vel per media plura vel pauciora, ita quod in connexione causarum determinate est causa in actu alterius partis cujuslibet partis contradictionis de futuro a te imaginatae. Cujus probatio est primo ex providentia divina, quia ex ipsa determinatum est quae pars cujuslibet contradictionis de futuro eveniet. Ipsa autem non est causa aliquorum effectuum nisi per connexionem causarum mediarum. Ergo in habitudine praesentium determinata est causa in actu cujuslibet effectus qui eveniret. Item nisi ita esset, si effectus futuri in praesentibus tantum haberent causam in potentia, et tunc si futura possunt esse, nihil causam futurorum de cetero fieret secundum actum. Ex causa enim in potentia tantum habet effectus quod possit esse; non autem quod sit secundum actum. Sed tamen non omnia futura habent causam in actu eodem modo, sed quaedam non impedibilem, quaedam autem impedibilem sed non impeditam.

Sexto considerandum est quod etsi in connexione praesentium omnia quae fient habeant causam in actu, non tamen omnia quae futura sunt necessario fient, sive referantur in causas particulares, sive in connexionem causarum, sive in providentiam divinam. Ex hoc enim quod aliquid est causa in actu non est causa necessaria; nam cum actus determinet et distinguat ex hoc quod aliquid est causa determinatae partis contradictionis, statim habet rationem causae in actu. Unde materia, quia aequaliter est in potentia utrumque contradictorum, solum habet rationem causae in potentia; aliquid autem est causa necessaria effectus ex impossibilitate aliter se habendi ad effectum. Nunc autem simul stant quod aliquid sit actu causa alicujus effectus et quod possit esse non causa alicujus effectus, sicut simul stant quod aliquid sit ens unum in actu et non ens illud in potentia, et quod aliquid sit album in actu et non album in potentia. Simul igitur stabunt quod aliquid sit causa in actu alicujus effectus et quod ipsum non sit causa necessaria illius.

Ex hoc apparet quod etsi omnis effectus futurus in praesentibus habeat causam in actu, non (94*ra*) tamen omnis effectus futurus necessario eveniet, sed tantum necessario evenient quae tantum in praesentibus habent causam necessariam non impedibilem. Quae autem in praesentibus habent causam non impeditam actu, quia cum hoc stat quod possibilis sit impediri, ideo quae ex causa non impedita eveniunt non necessario eveniunt; quamvis quae ex causa non impedita eveniunt necessario eveniant quando non impedita est, sicut non necessarium[18] est Sortem currere, quamvis Sortem currere quando currit necessarium sit.

Eodem autem modo dicendum est effectus futuros evenire ex causis suis particularibus non impeditis, et ex connexione omnium causarum, et ex providentia divina. Et ideo si referendo ad unum istorum non omnes effectus necessario eveniant, nec referendo ad alterum.

Advertendum autem est quod omnes effectus futuros procedere a causis non impedibilibus tollit arbitrii libertatem, quia voluntas, si ex causa aliqua moveatur ad volendum aliquid et causa illa non impedibilis sit, alias quandoque movebitur, et ex causa illa idem necessario volet et resistere non poterit. Non habebit igitur arbitrium liberum.

Item frustra fieret consilium contra quaecumque ventura. Ex quo enim causae omnium futurorum non impedibiles essent, nihil valeret consilium ad impediendum causas quin effectus suos producerent. Et ex hoc patet quod istud tolleret punitiones fieri debere, et retraheret ab actibus bonis; quae omnia sunt contra Fidei veritatem et contra Aristotelis intentionem.

Sed quosdam effectus futuros fieri a causis non impeditis, impedibilibus tamen, non tollit arbitrii libertatem si recta intelligatur. Non enim voluntas sic libera est quod sit causa prima sui velle; immo necesse est eam moveri ex aliqua apprehensione. Nec est sic libera pro praesente volito ipsi voluntati, et ipsis existentibus in dispositione in qua hoc quidem natum sit movere, illud autem moveri, possit voluntas velle vel non velle indifferenter; immo necesse est eam velle ut sic existentem. Sed est voluntas libera quantum ad hoc quod ipsa a nullo potest moveri quod non sit impedibile et etiam quandoque actu impeditum. Sic tamen non est de judicio sensibilium. Visus enim apprehendens album non potest judicare non album, et hoc si fuerit sensatio albi, ut in quarto habitum est.

Item effectum procedere a talibus causis non tollit consilium. Cum enim aliqui effectus motivi futuri sint[19] a causis a quibus, quando non fuerint impeditae, necessario proveniunt, tamen cum impedibiles fuerint, quaerendum est consilium ad eos impediendum. Sed cum omnes effectus futuri ordinati fuerint a providentia divina, est non quaerendum consilium ad impediendum[20] providentiam divinam.

Item superius dictum est quod ex connexione causarum in entibus cujuslibet contradictionis de futuro, altera pars determinate in praesentibus habet causam in actu. In praesentibus igitur determinatum est vel quod ego bonus approbandus vel malus reprobandus. Frustra igitur studebo bene aut male (94*rb*) facere.

Ad primum[21] dico quod non est studendum ad impediendum providentiam divinam, sed magis ad eam explendum. Unde cum magis artet providentia divina effectus futuros ad eventum quam connexus causarum vel causae particulares non impeditae, sicut non est quaerendum consilium ad impediendum causam non impeditam quando non impedita est, ita nec ad impediendum providentiam divinam; quamvis cum causa ista necessario producat effectum quando non impedita, ipsa tamen impedibilis est, ideo ad eum impediendum quaerendum est consilium.

Ad aliud[22] dictum est superius quod, etsi cujuslibet futuri in praesentibus sit causa in actu, non tamen quaelibet causa in actu est causa necessaria; sunt enim multae impedibiles. Et ideo studere debet unusquisque ad hoc ut fiat bonus, ut suo diligenti studio impediat aliquas causas particulares impedibiles quae facerent ipsum malum nisi impedirentur. Si omnes causae non essent impedibiles, nostrum studium non valeret.

---

[18] *Ms* necessariam.

[19] *Ms* fit or sit.

[20] *Ms* impedimentum; impediendum in margin.

[21] Reply to objection *supra*, paragraph Item effectum procedere . . .

[22] Reply to objection *supra*, paragraph Item superius . . .

Ad rationes respondendum est.

[Ad 1,2] Ad illas de connexione causarum apparet solutio ex praedictis. Quamvis enim a causa necessario eveniat effectus quando non impedita est, a causa tamen non impedita non necessario provenit effectus, eo quod ipsa impedibilis est, quamvis non impedibilis quando non est impedita.

[Ad 3,4] Ad aliud quod arguitur de providentia divina, apparet ex dictis quod providentia divina non in alio modo artat effectus futuros ad eventus et connexio causarum; et ideo si ex connexione causarum non eveniant omnia necessario, nec ex providentia divina. Sed cum providentia divina sit infallibilis, quid in entibus respondet infallibilitati ejus? Dico quod non eventus necessarius omnium effectuum futurorum, sed huic infallibilitati respondent alia duo impossibilia aliter se habere. Quorum unum est causae in actu in praesentibus determinatae omnium eorum quae evenient, et ceterum quod causa non impedita, quamvis habet potentiam ut impediatur, non tamen habet potentiam ut impediatur quando non impedita est.

[Ad 5] Ad aliud de praescientia divina, dicendum quod infallibilitati praescientiae divinae correspondent duo praedicta; et ceterum adjici potest et quod futurum, quando est, necesse est esse futura, aut cernit Deus tamquam praesentia. Est autem notandum quod praescientia hominis de aliquo futuro artaret ipsum ad eventum necessarium; praescientia autem Dei nequaquam. Cujus ratio est quia praescientia hominis non potest esse nisi alicujus futuri necessarii; tale autem necessario eveniet. Praescientia autem Dei est et futurorum contingentium et necessariorum.

The Lateran Missal and Some Allied Documents

V. L. KENNEDY C.S.B.

By the Lateran Missal, we mean that mass book contained in Codex 65 of the Archives of the Basilica of St. John Lateran at Rome. A partial edition was made of this manuscript in 1754 by Emmanuel Azevedo S.J. under the title: *Vetus Missale Romanum Monasticum Lateranense.*[1] Dr. A. Ebner gave a brief description of this missal in his catalogue of the sacramentaries and missals in the libraries of Italy basing his information on the edition of Azevedo;[2] he states in a footnote that he was unable to discover whether this manuscript was still in existence or not.[3] Thanks to the courtesy of Mgr. Pierre Pfister, Canon of St. John Lateran, the present writer was able to examine this manuscript during a recent visit to Rome. As a result, we are now in a position to judge the value of Azevedo's edition.

Codex 65 of the Lateran Archives is a manuscript in parchment of 327 numbered folios, 302 mm. x 214 mm., with one column of 25 or 26 lines to the page. In addition, there are at the beginning four unnumbered folios containing the remnants of a calendar and two flyleaves in paper. On the first of these is written in a modern hand: *Liber missalis Basilicae Lateranensis editum Romae MDCCLII* (sic) *cura Emmanuelis de Azevedo Soc. Jes. typis Jos. Collini in 4°. Invenitur in bibliotheca S. Aloysii Francorum* B. 32. On the second flyleaf in a similar hand is the notation: *Liber Missalis Archivii Basilicae S. Joannis in Laterano.* The manuscript is badly stained and damaged from much handling and as a consequence it is difficult at times to read the folio numbers and even some parts of the text. We will leave the dating of the manuscript until we have described its contents.

In the introduction to his edition, Azevedo gave a description of its content. "Our codex", he says, "is divided into two parts. The first part seems somewhat earlier both by reason of the handwriting and also from the content; it contains the orations, the gospels, the prefaces and the Canon. The second part, which is sewn to, and joined to, the first, seems a little more recent both from the handwriting and the contents; it contains the epistles, the antiphons for the introit, the gradual responses, and the antiphons for the offertory and the communion. Thus in this one volume are contained all those things which in earlier times were found in four separate books."[4] This description is quite accurate save for the fact that he neglected to say, or did not notice, that the second part is abundantly supplied with rubrics and these rubrics reveal very clearly, as we shall show, just when the missal was composed. In spite of the fact that Azevedo realized clearly that this one volume contains all the parts of the mass and is therefore a complete missal, he confined his edition to part one only. The result is that, ever since his day, scholars have been taking the part for the whole and giving the name *Vetus missale Lateranense* to what is only part one of the Lateran Missal.

The edition of Azevedo comprises then: (a) the fragment of the calendar on the first four unnumbered folios;[5] (b) the text of the Lateran Missal from fol. 1ʳ to fol. 208^{r} of the manuscript.[6] Unedited, and apparently quite unknown, are the contents of the manuscript from fol. 208^{v} to fol. 327^{v}. As far as Azevedo's edition goes, it is quite well done. We notice, however, that he gives only the first line or two of the gospels which are found in their entirety in the manuscript.[7] In view of the fact that the edition of Azevedo is extremely rare today, we will give here a summary of the contents of the whole missal.

---

[1] The title page reads as follows: *Vetus Missale Romanum Monasticum Lateranense. Cum praefatione, notis, et nonnullis opusculis quae omnia nunc primum in lucem eduntur a* P. Emmanuele de Azevedo, Societatis Jesu. Romae, DCCLIV. Typis Josephi Collini.

[2] Adalbert Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum im Mittelalter. Iter Italicum.* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1896), pp. 168-9.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 168, n. 1.

[4] *Vetus Missale*, p. viii.

[5] *Vetus Missale* pp. xlix-lvi. Azevedo gives a second calendar made up of the feasts that are actually found in the missal (pp. lvii-lxviii).

The fragment of calendar at the beginning contains the months of May to December inclusive. Only the upper half of the first two folios remains, so that part of the months of May, June, July and August are missing. The list of feasts is not extensive and entries have been made by various hands, some as late as the end of the thirteenth century. The calendar contains feasts that are not found in the missal,[8] which is quite usual; but what is rather unusual, it does not contain a considerable number of saints for whom there is a mass in the missal.[9] Since there is a possibility that these four unnumbered folios, on which the calendar is found, were bound up with the rest of the manuscript at a later date and may not belong to it, we will not rely on it in judging the *provenance* of our missal.

The missal proper begins on fol 1^{r} with the mass for the first Sunday of Advent. Under this heading come the collect, the gospel, the secret and the postcommunion. This fixes the style for the masses in the first part; normally the full text is given for each day's prayers and gospel but occasionally the scribe will merely give a reference for the gospel with the rubric: *Require in.* After the first Sunday of Advent, the proper of the time continues without interruption until Easter Sunday. Following the mass for Easter, and not before as is usual, are given the texts for the prefaces for the various seasons of the year and for the feasts of Our Lady. The last preface is the common one with the full text from *Per omnia secula seculorum.;* the initial *P* and the *VD* of the preface are ornamental capitals. The Canon of the mass follows, having a large initial *T* with a serpent wound around the shaft of the *T*. The Canon has no rubrics and no saint-names are added to the lists in the *Communicantes, Nobis quoque* or the *Libera,* although the scribe has left space for additional names in the first two of these. At the end of the Canon, there are a few rubrics and a number of communion prayers; these are reprinted by Ebner[10] from the edition of Azevedo. After the *Ite missa est,* there is the *Placeat* and a series of prayers after mass.[11]

The proper of the time then resumes with the mass for Monday of Easter week and continues to the twenty-fifth[12] Sunday after Pentecost; then a mass for *Dominica de trinitate.* We note that this proper of the time excludes all saint days even those that come between Christmas and New Years. The sanctoral begins without title on fol. 138^{r} with the feast of St. Nicholas (Dec. 7) and closes with the feast of St. Andrew (Nov. 30). The saints of the Christmas octave (Stephen, John the Evangelist, Innocents,[13] Sylvester) come in the sanctoral after the feast of Gregory Martyr (Dec. 24).

Immediately after the feast of St. Andrew, the common of saints begins. We note a change of style here; the epistle is given as well as the gospel and the orations, and in some cases, we find a choice of two or more epistles and gospels. The votive masses follow; they are numerous and have as a rule only the orations. The first section of the missal ends with three complete masses, i.e., they have all the parts including the "sung" parts. These are: *Pro peccatis, De Trinitate* and *In dedicatione;* Azevedo's edition ends with the second of these.

---

[6] *Vetus Missale,* pp. 1-326.

[7] One instance of bad editing is found on p. 107 for the preface of the Blessed Virgin. The original text in the manuscript reads . . . *gloria permanente huic mundo lumen eternum effudit;* this is corrected by a later hand into: *lumen eternum mundo effudit.* Azevedo has given only the correction. On the importance of this text, see: Abbot B. Capelle, 'La préface romaine de la vierge,' *Rev. Hist. Eccl.,* XXXVIII (1942), 55-6.

[8] For example: Nov. 9: *Dedicatio Salvatoris;* Dec. 8: *Conceptio B.M.V.;* Aug. 12: *S. Clare;* Oct. 4: *S. Francisci Conf.*

[9] For example: Oct. 7: Sergius and Bacchus; Oct. 14: Calixtus; Nov. 24: Columbanus.

[10] Ebner, *Iter Italicum,* p. 169.

[11] The text of these will be found in Ebner, *ibid.* p. 169.

[12] Azevedo only gives 24 Sundays after Pentecost. On fol. 125^{r} of the manuscript, the rubric is quite clear: *Dominica XXV post pent.*

[13] In the margin (fol. 121^{v}) for this feast we read in a slightly later hand: *Non dicitur Gloria in excelsis, Credo* nec *Alleluia* nec *Ite missa est.* Dicitur *Benedicamus Domino. Deo Gratias* secundum Cur. Rom.

We come now to the unpublished part of the manuscript, the second section of the Lateran Missal. It begins on fol. 210^r with the title: *Incipit Liber Epistolarii Totius Anni.* This title, undoubtedly copied by the scribe from one of the books at his disposal, is misleading for we see at once that is not an epistolary but a combination of the antiphonary and the epistolary. The first mass for *Dominica prima de adventu* has the introit, the epistle, the gradual, the offertory and the communion. This sets the style for the second part of the missal. Then comes the proper of the time to the twenty-fifth sunday after Pentecost, followed by the mass for the Trinity. The proper of saints follows beginning with the Vigil of St. Andrew (Nov. 29) and continuing to the month of April where the manuscript ends abruptly.[14] We note again in this part that the feasts of the saints during the octave of Christmas are given in the sanctoral. For Palm Sunday and last three days of Holy Week, there are complete rubrics for the ceremonies.

It is apparent then that the second section of the Lateran Missal complements and completes the first, so that the priest has in one volume a complete mass book. This was one of the ways in which the old service books were combined to form a missal and it denotes a rather advanced stage in the process.[15] Our present system, of having all the variable parts of each mass conveniently combined, is the definitive solution to the problem, and it is first found, it seems, in the thirteenth-century Franciscan Missal whose arrangement is due to the genius of Haymo of Faversham, minister general of the Friars Minor from 1240 to 1244. The plan of the Lateran Missal, in which the orations and the gospels are placed in the first part and the epistle and the choir parts in the second, is but one step away from the final stage in the evolution of the missal.

The two parts of the Lateran Missal were written by two different, though probably contemporary, scribes, but the concordance between the two parts for the order of the feasts indicates that the missal was a planned project from the beginning. Further evidence of this fact is found in the manner of numbering the folios. The manuscript is supplied with folio numbers throughout in the usual place on the upper right hand corner of the *recto;* these are in Roman numerals and run continuously from *i* to *cccxxvii* and appear to be in the same hand as that of the first scribe. In the second part, we find a second system of numbering on the upper left corner of the *verso* of each folio beginning with *i* on the back of folio *ccx;* when the second scribe gives a reference—which is quite frequently—he uses this numeration, e.g., *Require retro in folio xxx.* The reason for this would appear to be as follows: the second scribe, knowing that his section is to be added to the first part, leaves the upper right hand corner of his folios free for the final numbering, but to avoid copying texts that recur again and again, he needs his own system of numbering so as to be able to make a reference to the folio on which the epistle or the choir parts have already appeared. It would then seem quite certain that the two parts of the manuscript were intended to form a single volume—a missal.

The name *Vetus Missale Lateranense* given to this missal is justified on the grounds that the manuscript has been at the Lateran for at least two hundred years. It was there when Azevedo made his copy of the first part of it in 1754 but no information was then available about its previous history, nor is there any now. We must then rely on internal evidence to determine whether or not the Lateran Missal, as the name implies, was intended for use at the Basilica of St. John Lateran in Rome.

---

[14] At least two gatherings have been lost from the missal. We note a few discrepancies in the sanctoral of this part. It begins with the Vigil of St. Andrew instead of the feast of St. Nicholas. It also has one additional feast, that of St. Valentine (Feb. 14).

[15] On this development, see J. A. Jungmann S.J., *The Mass of the Roman Rite (Missarum Sollemnia)*, Tr. F. A. Brunner C.SS.R. I (New York, 1950), pp. 104-7. Also A. Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, pp. 359-63.

Normally when a sacramentary or a missal is intended for use at Rome, it has an indication of the station for the services on the principal feasts. Frequently even mass books written far from Rome contain such rubrics in the ninth and tenth centuries but the names of the stations disappear, as a rule, in non-Roman books in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. If such a model were used by a scribe at Rome, he too might omit the stations, particularly if his missal were intended for monastic use. The complete absence of the indication of the stations in the Lateran Missal is not then a certain proof of non-Roman origin.

A mass book written for use at the Basilica of St. John Lateran—the pope's cathedral—should, if it contains directions for ceremonies, take into account the possibility of the pope being the celebrant. The Lateran Missal has copious rubrics for Holy Week; in these the celebrant is always the priest (*sacerdos*), never the pope or a cardinal or a bishop.[16]

Furthermore we know exactly what feasts were celebrated at the Basilica of St. John Lateran about the year 1150 from the *ordo* of that church composed by Cardinal Bernard, prior of the Lateran.[17] This *ordo* shows that the feast of the Dedication of St. John Lateran was celebrated at that period with particular solemnity.[18] There is no mass for this feast (Nov. 9) in the Lateran Missal which, as we shall see, must be dated later than the *ordo*. Moreover the same *ordo* shows the effect of a liturgical decree of Pope Gregory VII (1073-1085). In this decree, as reported by Bernold of Constance (d. 1100), the pope ordered that "the feasts of the Roman pontiffs who were martyrs be celebrated everywhere with a complete office."[19] This papal instruction seems to have been largely disregarded, but it was carried out at the Lateran. Bernard's *ordo* lists the feasts of some twelve pope-martyrs whose names do not appear in the old Roman sacramentaries, e.g., Melchiades (Dec. 10), Hyginus (Jan. 11), etc.[20] Not one of these feasts appears in the Lateran Missal.

The sanctoral of our missal is basically that of the Gregorian Sacramentary at the end of the eighth century with that admixture of Gelasian elements which becomes part and parcel of the sanctoral of Roman mass books in the Frankish kingdom during the ninth and tenth centuries.[21] To this basic list, there are added: (a) a few feasts which betray the long sojourn of the Roman sacramentaries in the north,[22] and (b) a considerable number of feasts proper to Italy which were inserted into these Franco-Roman, or Germano-Roman, mass books when they were brought down from the north by German ecclesiastics in the first half of the eleventh century.[23] It is these latter feasts which enable us, as a rule, to localize a missal and to say that it was written for a certain city, church or monastery.

The sanctoral of the Lateran Missal has a considerable number of saints whose feast was commonly celebrated in the north-central part of Italy. We note: Sabinus (Dec. 7), Gregory Martyr (Dec. 24), Laurentius and Peregrinus (June

---

[16] See the text in the *Appendix* to this article.

[17] L. Fischer, *Ordo Officiorum Ecclesiae Lateranensis*, (Historische Forschungen und Quellen, Heft 2 u. 3, München u. Freising, 1916).

[18] Fischer, *Ordo*, pp. 157-9.

[19] *Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus*, c. 43; PL 151, 1010.

[20] Fischer, *Ordo*, pp. 123, 124, *et passim*.

[21] V. Leroquais, *Les Sacramentaires et les Missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* I (Paris, 1924), p. xlv.

[22] For example: St. Dionysius and companions (Oct. 9).

[23] On this point, see: M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen-âge* I (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 11, Louvain, 1931), pp. 511-6.

3), Donatus and Hilarian (Aug. 7), Christina (May 7), Prosper (Nov. 24). Of these, Laurentius and Peregrinus, Donatus and Hilarion point to Arezzo.[24] On June 1, there are added to the name of Nichomedes, whose name stands alone on this date in most missals of the time, the following: Justinus, Crescentianus, Gricinianus, Verianus, Orphytus, Exsuperantius, Benedictus and Fortunatus. This group is associated with Tifernum (Città del Castello) and Urbino in Umbria.[25] On June 22 which is the feast of Paulinus of Nola, we find in the prayers the commemoration of Albinus and Paulinus, martyrs '*et Niceti episcopi cum nongentis octoginta novem aliis*'. The feast has a mass for the vigil and for the day itself: *in die ad missam*. This combination of saints is rather unusual but exactly the same group is found in an eleventh-century missal from the cathedral of St. Donatus in Arezzo (Vatican *Cod. lat.* 4772).[26] Frequently on this day, missals of Italian origin have a feast for 1,480 martyrs with, or without, St. Paulinus;[26a] we note in one case (Bibl. Barberini *Cod.* XII, 3) that the feast is to be celebrated with a vigil.[27] In any case, the exact listing of Albinus (Albanus), Paulinus, Nicetas and 989 martyrs is common only to the Lateran Missal and that of Arezzo.

On July 29, the usual entry in missals of this period is: Felix, Simplicius, Faustinus and Beatrix, i.e., Pope Felix II, and the three martyrs of the Cemetery of Generosa on the *Via Portuensis* near Rome. The Lateran Missal adds to these the names of Flora and Lucilla. These names are associated with Ostia but their bodies were transferred by a Bishop John to Arezzo where they become the titular patrons of a famous Benedictine Monastery, *Monasterium SS. Florae et Lucillae*.[28] A number of papal letters dated between 1134 and 1196 testify to its importance at this period.[29] The addition of the names of Flora and Lucilla to the list of this day points again to Arezzo, but the fact that they are given so little prominence makes it unlikely that our missal or its immediate ancestor came from the monastery of which they were the patrons.

A number of other points should be noted about the sanctoral of the Lateran Missal. On Sept. 29, it has two masses in honor of St. Michael the archangel: the first is entitled *Inventio Basilicae*, the second *Dedicatio*.[30] The name of Michael is added in the *Libera nos quaesumus* prayer on Good Friday.[31] The cult of the archangel is extremely widespread in the eleventh and twelfth centuries especially in the north of Italy. We note that the Lateran *ordo* of *ca.* 1150, has the second feast of St. Michael on May 8 under the present title: *apparitio*;[32] here again the Lateran Missal is not following the *ordo*. The presence in our missal of feasts for St. Benedict (Mar. 21), St. Scholastica (Feb. 10) and a commemoration of St. Columban (Nov. 23) give it a monastic tinge, but since none of these are celebrated with any particular solemnity, it would not be prudent to press the point. On Oct. 7, the feast of SS. Sergius and Bacchus is combined with that of St. Mark, the pope.[33] It is rather unusual to find a mass in their honour in a missal before the middle of the thirteenth century especially outside of Rome.[34] At Rome, their feast is indicated in the *ordo* of the Lateran;[35] they are the patrons of the one of the *diaconiae*[36] and of a monastery attached to the Lateran which was founded by Paschal I (817-824)[37] but which seems to have disappeared by the twelfth century.[38] We note, too, the feasts of St. Augustine (Aug. 28) and St. Jerome (Oct. 30); both are found in the Lateran *ordo* where the former is called "our holy father Augustine the patron of the order of canons."[39]

---

[24] The four names are found in the *Communicantes* of the Canon in an eleventh-century sacramentary from the cathedral of Arezzo, Vat. *Cod. Lat.* 4772. Ebner, *Iter Ital.* p. 225.

[25] *Acta Sanct. Jun.* I, pp. 56 ff. F. Lanzoni, *Le Origini delle Diocesi antiche d'Italia* (Studi e Testi, 35, Rome, 1923), p. 296.

[26] Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, p. 225.

[26a] Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, pp. 143, 204, 220.

[27] Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, p. 143.

[28] *Acta Sanct. Jul.* VII, pp. 38-40. Lanzoni, *Le Origini delle Diocesi*, p. 73, P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* III, p. 161.

[29] Kehr, *Italia Pont.* III, pp. 162-163.

[30] The original feast is that of the dedication of the Basilica on the *Via Salaria* at Rome. Non-Roman scribes confuse this with the apparition on Monte Gargano. As a result we find such odd combinations as here. A third event, a victory of the Lombards on May 8, 663, gives rise to another title: *Victoria*. So we find such terms as: *revelatio, inventio, apparitio, victoria*, and *dedicatio* attached to these feasts. See Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, pp. 220, 221, 259, etc.

[31] See text in the *Appendix* to this article. For the very common practice of adding the name of Michael to the *Libera* in Italian mass books, see Ebner, *Iter Italicum*, p. 427.

[32] Fischer, *Ordo Off. Lateran.* p. 136.

[33] Azevedo in his introduction uses this feast as his reason for attributing the Lateran Missal to the Monastery of SS. Sergius and Bacchus. We have two lists of the monasteries of Rome in the twelfth century,

We have outlined the sanctoral as found in the first part of the Lateran Missal; the sanctoral in the second part adds nothing to our information since the greater portion of it is missing as a number of gatherings have been lost at the end of the manuscript.

Judging from the sanctoral alone, one would be inclined to say that the missal was intended for a church or monastery in or near Arezzo. We prefer to say that the scribe who wrote the first part of the Lateran Missal used as his model a sacramentary that originated at Arezzo or its environs. The reason for this caution is the fact that the Lateran *ordo*, if judged merely on the basis of the saint-names listed therein, might give the impression that it, too, was intended for north-central Italy and for Lucca in particular.[40] The presence of such saints as St. Fridian in this thoroughly Roman *ordo* has a very natural explanation. We know that, in the first half of the twelfth century, the canons of St. John Lateran were largely recruited from the church of St. Fridian of Lucca.[41] That they brought with them the service books of that church is clearly apparent in the *ordo* of the Lateran. It may well be that a sacramentary from Arezzo was brought to Rome through the same, or a similar, channel and there served as a model for the scribe who wrote part one of the Lateran Missal. We have stated our reasons for believing that this missal was not intended for use at the Lateran Basilica, but we shall now see that it was written in a *milieu* in which the liturgy of the Roman Curia was well known.

Azevedo dates the Lateran Missal "at the end of the eleventh century."[42] He based his judgment on the handwriting and on the fact that the manuscript contains no feast later than the end of the eleventh century. That this dating is at least one hundred years too early is apparent from the internal evidence of the rubrics for Palm Sunday and the last three days of Holy Week found in the second section of the missal. These rubrics, as we shall show, are dependent on the *Ordinarium* of the Roman Curia. The handwriting in this second part is somewhat different from that of the first, but in the opinion of experts, the differences are so slight that the two hands must be considered contemporaneous. Both hands show evidence of a transitional stage in the evolution of the round Italian style of writing which develops at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century.[43] The conclusions arrived at from the

---

one by Peter Mallius and the other by John the Deacon. Neither mention this monastery. The lists will be found in: Mabillon, *Musei Italici* II (Paris, 1724), pp. 160-1, 574.

[34] Ebner has no mention of their feast in his catalogue for Italy. Leroquais, in his catalogue for France, has one instance before the thirteenth century, a tenth-century sacramentary of Angers; *Les Missels* I, p. 87. Their feast is found in the ninth-century Marble Calendar of Naples. D. Mallardo, 'Il Calendario marmorea di Napoli,' *Eph. Lit.*, LX (1946), 247.

[35] Fischer, *Ordo Off. Lateran*, p. 155.

[36] In the twelfth list of *Diaconiae*, cf. Mabillon, *Musei Ital.* II, 574.

[37] *Liber Pontificalis* II, ed. Duchesne, p. 56.

[38] See *supra*, note 33.

[39] Fischer, *Ordo Off. Lateran.*, pp. 151-2.

[40] We note the following names in the Lateran *ordo*: Fridian (Lucca), Sabinus (Spoleto) Cassius (Imola), Prosper (Reggio), Donninus (Parma), Cerbonius (Populonia) etc.

[41] The history of this recruiting is given by Fischer, *Ordo Off. Lateran.* pp. xi-xiii. For the texts of the papal letters, cf. Kehr, *Italia Pont.* III, pp. 420-2.

[42] *Vetus Missale*, p. xxxviii: *saeculo XI exeunte vel non multo ante scriptum fuisse.*

[43] Some further details on the handwriting. For the lettrines: the manuscript has both uncial and capital forms; some of these are closed. This indicates a period of transition occurring in the last years of the twelfth and the early years of the thirteenth. For the individual letters: some *i*'s are stroked. double *ii* often; complete absence of *ae;* long

internal evidence of the second part of the manuscript must then apply equally to the first part insofar as the date of the manuscript is concerned.

As far as the internal evidence is concerned, the rubrics for the Good Friday services give us the key to the approximate date of the Lateran missal, for in these rubrics we find a complete rejection of the Amalarian theory of consecration by contact.[44] In the mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday, the ancient Roman rite prescribed the use of Bread that had been consecrated the previous day and the use of ordinary wine which was placed in the chalice in the course of the Good Friday service. Early in the ninth century, Amalar of Metz propounded the theory that this wine was consecrated by the particle of the Bread which was dropped into the chalice at the *fractio*: *Sanctificatur enim vinum non consecratum per sanctificatum panem.*[45] This Amalarian phrase finds its way into the service books of the Latin world in the tenth century, and in particular, into the Roman-German Pontifical composed at Maintz shortly after 950.[46] When this work found its way to Rome under German influences in the first half of the eleventh century,[47] the Amalarian theory was undisputed. From the Roman-German Pontifical, the Amalarian phrase passes into such thoroughly Roman books as: The twelfth-century Roman Pontifical,[48] the Lateran *Ordo* of Prior Bernard,[49] and the *Ordinarium* of the Roman Curia.[50] This latter document was a composition of approximately the year 1220 and gave detailed rubrics of the manner of carrying on the services in the papal chapel at the time of Innocent III (1198-1216) and of his predecessors. It has come down to us only in a late and interpolated form found in a fourteenth-century manuscript (Paris, Bibl. Nat. *Lat.* 4162A), but fortunately copious extracts of its rubrics had been used in an early Franciscan service book, called the Breviary of St. Clare, composed about 1230.[51] In the Breviary of St. Clare, and consequently in the original form of the *Ordinarium*, the Amalarian phrase reads: *Sanctificatur enim vinum non consecratum per corpus domini immissum.* And, in this form, it is still found in the Missal of the Papal Chapel at the end of the thirteenth century.[52] This last case, however, is more or less an exception to the trend of the times, for a new factor has entered the situation, the teaching of theologians and canonists on the consecration or the conversion of the bread and wine into the Body and the Blood of Christ.

We have traced the development of this teaching in an earlier number of this review.[53] It is sufficient to say here that as early as the last two decades of the twelfth century, Peter Cantor (d. 1197), in his lectures at Paris, was formally denying the Amalarian theory of consecration by contact,[54] and certainly no theologian at the beginning of the thirteenth century would agree with Amalar's statement. However, it seems to have taken some time for the teaching of theologians to penetrate the realm of rubrics. Up to the present, there were known to be three liturgical documents of the early thirteenth century, of

---

stroke below line on *h.* etc. These characteristics are present in *both* parts of the manuscript.

[44] On the history of this theory, see M. Andrieu, *Immixtio et Consecratio. La Consécration par contact dans les documents liturgiques du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1924).

[45] J. M. Hanssens, *Amalarii Episcopi Opera Liturgica Omnia* II (Studi e Testi, 139, Città del Vaticano, 1948). *Liber Officialis* I, 15, p. 546.

[46] Andrieu, *Immixtio*, pp. 64-5.

[47] Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani* I, pp. 511-6.

[48] M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain au Moyen-Age*, I. *Le Pontifical Romain du XII^e^ Siécle* (Studi e Testi, 86, Città del Vaticano, 1938), p. 237.

[49] Fischer, *Ordo Off. Lateran.*, p. 58.

[50] Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain* II, *Appendix* II, p. 562.

[51] A. Cholat, *Le Bréviaire de sainte Clare conservé au Couvent de Saint-Damien à Assise et son importance liturgique* (Opuscules de critique historique, fasc. VIII, Paris, 1904), pp. 34-49. M. Andrieu, 'L'Ordinaire de la Chapelle papale et le Cardinal Jacques Gaetani Stefaneschi,' *Eph. Lit.*, *XXXIX* (1935) 230-60.

[52] M. Andrieu, 'Le Missel de la Chapelle papale à la fin du XIII^e^ siécle', *Miscellanea Francesco Ehrle* II (Rome, 1924), pp. 348-76. For the text, see M. Andrieu, *Pontifical Romain* II, *Appendix* II, p. 562, col. 2.

[53] V. L. Kennedy, 'The Moment of Consecration and the Elevation of the Host,' *Mediaeval Studies*, VI (1944), 121-50.

[54] Kennedy, *ibid.* p. 143.

Roman origin, in which the Amalarian theory is rejected: (a) the thirteenth-century Roman Pontifical of the Curia;[55] (b) the Missal of the Friars Minor according to the custom of the Roman Curia;[56] (c) the revised or corrected text of the *Ordinarium* of the Roman Curia. To these, we must now add a fourth, the old Lateran Missal.[57]

Two of these documents have been assigned to definite dates by competent scholars. The thirteenth-century Roman Pontifical of the Curia, in its longer form, belongs to the time of Pope Innocent IV (1243-1254).[58] The Franciscan Missal (*Ordo missalis Fratrum Minorum secundum consuetudinem Curiae Romanae*) is a composition of Haymo of Faversham, Minister General of the Franciscans from 1240 to 1244.[59] The correction of the Good Friday rubric in the *Ordinarium* of the Roman Curia cannot be dated with complete accuracy but in the opinion of Professor Andrieu, the *Ordinarium* was revised on this point shortly after its composition, and in this form, it is the source of the rubric in the Pontifical of 1243-1254.[60] The date of the Lateran Missal is left in abeyance for the moment.

For the sake of comparison, we give the rubrics for the mass of the Presanctified from the end of the *Pater Noster* as they appear in these documents.

(a) Ordinarium Curiae Romanae (with the correction in brackets):
. . . frangat hostiam secundum consuetudinem, ponens de ea in calice nichil dicens. Sanctificatur enim vinum non consecratum per corpus domini inmissum. *Pax domini* non dicatur, *Agnus Dei* non cantatur, neque pacis osculum datur. Communicat autem solus pontifex sine ministris, non ad sedem sollempniter, sed ibi tantum eo die ante altare, ob humilitatem reverentie diei et passionis Christi <cum omnibus orationibus consuetis preter illam *Domine Iesu Christ qui ex voluntate* et cet. quia facit de sanguine mentionem et postquam communicaverit et manus seu digitos laverit ut moris est revertitur ad medium altaris et coram ipso inclinatus dicit *Quod ore sumpsimus* et non *Corpus tuum* nec *Placeat.*>[61]

(b) Pontificale Romanae Curiae:
. . . frangat hostiam more solito et ponat particulam in calice nichil dicens. *Pax domini* non dicitur. *Agnus Dei* non cantatur, neque pacis osculum datur, neque postcommunio cantatur. Communicat autem solus pontifex sine ministris non ad sedem solemniter sed ibi tantum eo die ante altare ob reverentiam passionis Christi, cum omnibus orationibus dici consuetis in perceptione dominici corporis, preter illam *Domine Iesu Christe qui ex voluntate,* quia facit de sanguine Christi mentionem, pretermissis illis que dici solent in sumptione calicis. Postquam vero communicaverit et digitos laverit, ut est moris, revertitur ad medium altaris et coram ipso inclinatus dicit *Quod ore sumpsimus.* Et non dicat *Corpus tuum* nec *Placeat.*[62]

(c) The Franciscan Missal 1240-1244:
. . . frangit hostiam more solito in tres partes. *Pax domini* non dicitur, *Agnus Dei* non cantatur, neque pacis osculum datur, sed immediate post fractionem unam partem de hostia mittit in calicem nichil dicens. Postmodum vero antequam duas partes recipiat, dicit omnia que dicere diebus aliis consuevit, pretermissa

---

[55] M. Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain* II, p. 469; cf. also pp. 304-6.

[56] The text of the Good Friday rubric is in *Appendix* I to the article: A. van Dijk, 'Il Carractere della Correzione liturgica di Fr. Aimone da Faversham,' *Eph. Lit.*, LX (1946), 336.

[57] See the text in the *Appendix* to this article, p. 75.

[58] Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain* II, p. 310.

[59] van Dijk, *art. cit.* p. 333; also *Eph. Lit.* LIX (1945), 220-3; cf. V. L. Kennedy, 'The Franciscan Ordo Missae in the Thirteenth Century,' *Med. Studies*, II (1940), 204-22.

[60] Andrieu, *Le Pontifical Romain* II, pp. 301-5.

[61] Andrieu, *Le Pont. Rom.* II, *Appendix* II, pp. 562-3, col. 1.

[62] Andrieu, *Le Pont. Rom.* II, pp. 468-9, col. 2.

oratione *Domine Iesu Christe fili Dei vivi qui ex voluntate patris,* quia fecit de sanguine mentionem. Quibus receptis et omissis omnibus que dicit solent ante sumptionem calicis, immediate particulam hostie cum vino et aqua de calice recipit reverenter. Facta communione ut dictum est, postcommunio non dicitur, sed sacerdos, more solito ablutis manibus, revertitur ad medium altaris et coram ipso inclinatus dicit *Quod ore sumpsimus* et cetera, omissis *Corpus tuum domine* et *Placeat.*[69]

(d) LATERAN MISSAL, FOL. 274^r:
. . . frangit hostiam more solito in tres partes. *Pax domini* non dicitur, *Agnus Dei* non cantatur neque pacis osculum datur. Sed immediate post fractionem unam partem de hostia mittit in calicem nichil dicens. Postmodum vero antequam duas reliquas partes recipiat, dicit omnia que dicere diebus aliis consuevit pretermissa oratione *Domine Iesu Christe fili Dei vivi qui ex voluntate patris* quia facit de sanguine mentionem. Quibus receptis et obmissis omnibus que dici solent ante sumptionem calicis immediate particulam hostie cum vino et aqua de calice recipit reverenter. Facta communione ut dictum est postcommunio non dicitur sed sacerdos more solito ablutis manibus revertitur ad medium altaris et coram ipso inclinatus dicit *Quod ore sumpsimus,* pretermissis *Corpus tuum quod sumpsi et sanguis* et *Placeat tibi* . . .

There is obviously a very close relationship between these four texts. The *Ordinarium* of the Curia has the Amalarian phrase; this is still retained when the correction is made. The correction is added awkwardly and after the rubric for communion. In the Pontifical of the Curia, the Amalarian phrase is dropped, but the correction is made in the same way after the rubric for the communion. We note that the Pontifical has two phrases which are not found in the *Ordinarium* or its correction: (a) *neque postcommunio cantatur;* (b) *pretermissis illis que dici solent in sumptione calicis.* We shall return to these in a minute.

In the Lateran Missal and the Franciscan Missal, the basic text of the original *Ordinarium* has been completely revised by a careful and painstaking workman who has in mind the priest as the celebrant and who corrects the Amalarian "theology" at the proper place—before the communion. These two documents are identical here save for two unimportant variants: *omissis* for *obmissis, omissis for pretermissis.* This verbal agreement in the rubrics of Holy Week as found in the two missals will be seen again and again; we will also find differences. It will be noted that the text of the Good Friday rubric, common to the two missals, has the two phrases found in the Pontifical but not in the correction of the *Ordinarium,* in slightly different words: (a) *postcommunio non dicitur;* (b) *omissis omnibus que dici solent ante sumptionem calicis.*

It is apparent that the *Ordinarium* of the Curia is the basic source of these documents. It is also clear that the Pontifical of the Curia is based on the corrected text of the *Ordinarium.* But where did the correction, i.e., the section in brackets in our text (a) and the two extra phrases in the Pontifical come from? They are too close in wording to the text found in both the Lateran and Franciscan Missals to be a mere coincidence. We suggest that the rubrics found in the Lateran Missal will provide the key to the puzzle.

To make certain of the fact that the rubrics of the Lateran Missal are based on the *Ordinarium* of the Curia, and that these rubrics are verbally the same as those of the Franciscan Missal, we will give the text for the ceremony of the adoration of the cross on Good Friday. In the first column, will be found the text of the *Ordinarium;* in the second the text of the Lateran Missal and the Franciscan Missal.

---

[69] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione,* *Appendix* I, p. 336.

ORDINARIUM CURIAE ROMANAE	FRANCISCAN MISSAL AND THE LATERAN MISSAL fol. 271ʳ-271ᵛ
Finitis orationibus procedit pontifex ad altare et, stans a dextro cornu altaris, accipit crucem a ministris sibi preparatam, sindone munda cooperatam et, discoperiens eam a summitate, elevatis paululum manibus, solus incipit ant. *Ecce lignum crucis,* adiuvantibus eum in cantu qui assistunt ei. Cum autem *Venite adoremus* cantaverint, omnes prostrati reverenter adorent et usque ad terram se inclinent. Et repetitur antiphona *Ecce lignum* a cantoribus in choro. Iterum pontifex paululum procedens et crucem ad medietatem discooperiens, amplius elevatis manibus, exaltando vocem, eandem antiphonam solus incipit, similiter in cantando iuvantibus eum qui circa ipsum sunt. Et secundo a cantoribus antiphona reincipitur. Et tertio procedit pontifex ante altare discooperiens crucem totam erectis sursum manibus, altius incipit *Ecce lignum crucis.* Et tertio a cantoribus repetitur antiphona. Et tertio dum cantatur *Venite adoremus adoretur ab omnibus.*[64]	Completis vero orationibus, sacerdos deposita tantum casula, procedit ad posterius cornu altaris dextrum et ibi accipit crucem a ministris sibi preparatam, quam versa facie ad chorum a summitate parum discooperit, incipiens solus ant. *Ecce lignum crucis* et ab illo loco in ant. iuvatur in cantu a ministris usque *Venite.* Choro vero cantante *Venite adoremus,* omnes se prosternunt. Postea procedit sacerdos ad reliquum dextrum cornu altaris et discooperiens amplius crucem elevans eam paulisper altius quam primo incipit *Ecce lignum crucis,* aliis cantantibus et adorantibus ut supra. Deinde sacerdos procedit ad medium altaris discooperiens crucem totaliter ac elevando eam tertio altius incipit *Ecce lignum crucis,* cantantibus aliis et adorantibus ut supra.[65]

We note at once the complete verbal agreement of the Lateran and the Franciscan Missal. The text in these two mass books is again the result of a careful revision of that of the *Ordinarium.* The composer has taken the rather involved and repetitious text of the *Ordinarium* and turned it into a simple straightforward description of the ceremony when it is to be performed by a priest. His dependence on the *Ordinarium* is obvious from the verbal coincidences. We do not suppose that anyone would claim that the *Ordinarium* is taking its text from the Lateran Missal. That is quite improbable in this instance; it is quite impossible in the case of the rubric for the mass of the Pre-sanctified, for the Amalarian theory did not come from our missal.

We are now able to fix definitively the *terminus post quem* for the Lateran Missal. Since the rubrics contained therein are a revision of those of the *Ordinarium,* we must date the Lateran Missal later than the *Ordinarium.* This latter document was composed certainly after the death of Innocent III (d. 1216) as its title implies: *Ordo curiae Romanae quem consuevimus observare tempore Innocenti tertii et aliorum pontificum.* It was used by the composer of the Missal-Breviary of St. Clare between 1227 and 1232. We are then sure that the *Ordinarium* was composed between 1216 and 1232. It follows that the Lateran Missal as it exists today in Codex 65 of the Lateran Archives must be later than 1216.

To determine how much later than 1216 this mass book was composed, we must settle the question of its relation with the Franciscan Missal. Is the Lateran Missal dependent on the Franciscan Missal for its rubrics? We have already seen two texts from these missals in which the rubrics are *verbatim* the same. There are three possible explanations of this fact: (a) the Lateran Missal copies from the Franciscan Missal; (b) the direct opposite; (c) a common source.

---

[64] Andrieu, *Pont. Rom.* II, *Appendix* II, p. 559, col. 2.

[65] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione, Appendix* I, p. 335.

In support of the first premise is the fact that in Haymo of Faversham, Franciscan Minister General 1240-1244, we have a trained theologian and a capable scholar.[66] The theological training is illustrated by the elimination of the Amalarian rubric and the rewriting of the Good Friday service to conform to the "modern" theories on the conversion of the elements. The precise, clear and straightforward statement of the rubrics is indicative of a trained mind. We know that Haymo's work was essentially one of correction. John of Parma, Minister General (1247-1257), warns the Friars to observe exactly "the *ordinarium* of the breviary and missal as corrected by the pious zeal of my predecessor, Friar Haymo of blessed memeory."[67] Haymo's work of correction is assumed to have been a revision of the rubrics of the *Ordinarium* of the Curia and a complete separation of the Breviary and the Missal with each having its own rubrics.[68] That, we believe, is essentially true. However, it does not rule out the possibility of an intermediate document in which Haymo found his rubrics ready made for certain days.

If we assume that the Lateran Missal is dependent on the Franciscan Missal for its rubrics, we have a few difficult questions to answer. We have seen that the obvious purpose back of the Lateran Missal was to place between the covers of one book all the parts of the mass; this was done by placing in the first part of it the prayers and the gospel for each day, and in the second part, the introit, epistle, gradual, offertory and communion, plus the essential rubrics for certain days. Now if we assume that the Franciscan Missal was available, with each day's service complete—as we must assume if we say that the Lateran is dependent on the Franciscan for the rubrics—then why should anyone compose such a missal as that of the Lateran? The aim or purpose of the "composer" of the Lateran Missal would already be accomplished and in a better way. Let us not forget that the purpose of the two missals is exactly the same: to provide a *complete* mass book for the ordinary priest, not the pope or a bishop. The solution of the problem arrived at in the Lateran Missal is an intermediate step in the development of the sacramentary into a missal; the Franciscan Missal is the definitive solution of the problem. The arrangement, then, of the Lateran Missal, not to mention the complete absence from it of "Franciscan saints,"[69] is an almost certain indication that it is prior in time to the composition of the Franciscan Missal of Haymo of Faversam.

A comparison of texts will show that this is so. We take a case where these rubrics are somewhat divergent in their wording in the two missals, the opening ceremonies of Good Friday. Here we give in parallel columns the text from each missal, italicizing the phrases which have been retained from the *Ordinarium.*

LATERAN MISSAL fol. 268^v	FRANCISCAN MISSAL
Cum nona cantatur, induantur sacerdos et minstri casulis nigris, si habent, et *sine luminaribus et incenso cum silentio ad altare procedunt et omnes*	Hora sexta fratres convenientes ad ecclesiam dicunt nonam, et interim sacerdos et ministri induti missalibus indumentis, completa nona, *sine lumin-*

---

[66] He taught theology at Paris before becoming a Friar in 1225. For his career, see the article: *Aimon de Faversham* in *Dict. d'Histoire et de Géographie* I, 1192-94.

[67] The Letter has been preserved in Wadding's *Annales Minorum;* it begins: *Quia sicut indubitanter; Annales Minorum* III (Quaracchi, 3ed., 1931), pp. 238-9.

[68] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione*, p. 185, (*Eph. Lit.* LIX, 1945).

[69] The names of Saints Francis and Clare are found in the fragment of calendar at the beginning; there are no masses in the missal in their honor. We have stated the reasons why we do not consider the calendar as belonging to the original missal, cf. *supra* p. 62.

prostrati ante altare diutius orent. Interim autem ministri unam toaleam mundissimam *extendunt super altare nudatum. Completa vero oratione,* sacerdos *deosculato altari ascendit sedem, et subdiaconus statim procedat ad legendum et sine titulo sic incipiat Hec dicit dominus. In tono lectionis legantur lectiones, et in sabbato* sancto similiter. *Hec dicit dominus, etc.* (*Text*)	*aribus et incenso procedunt* et ante altare *prostrati* aliquamdiu *orent.* Accoliti vero *interim unam tantum toaliam extendunt super altare,* et sacerdos, finita *oratione* sua *deosculatur altare* et in loco suo cum ministris sedet. Unus vero *subdiaconus procedit ad legendum et sine titulo incipit* prophetiam *Hec dicit dominus . . .*[70]

It is quite apparent here that the rubrics of the Lateran Missal retain more of the wording of the *Ordinarium* than do those of the Franciscan Missal. In the text of the latter, we note the precise simple style of the writer; he eliminates all unnecessary words and repetitions, and at the same time he improves the wording. On the other hand, the text of the Lateran Missal at this point resembles the "sacristy" Latin of the *Ordinarium.* It is quite clear in this instance that the rubricist of the Lateran Missal is not using the Franciscan Missal. We must then abandon our first premise that the Lateran Missal copied its rubrics from the Missal of Haymo of Faversham.

We come now to the second possibility, *viz.,* that the Franciscan Missal depends for its rubrics upon the Lateran Missal. The answer is certainly in the negative if we mean *all* the rubrics, for the Franciscan Missal has many rubrics that are not to be found in our missal, e.g., for the Ordinary and the Canon of the mass, for Ash Wednesday, etc. Moreover for the days provided with rubrics in both missals, those in the Franciscan Missal are sometimes more extensive and show a further development in the ceremony. We take the ceremony of placing the elements on the altar for the mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday, after the singing of the *improperia.*

LATERAN MISSAL fol. 273^{r}	FRANCISCAN MISSAL:
Dum supradicta cantantur, palla super toaleam extenditur et corporale super pallam. Sacerdos vero corpus domini quod pridie fuerat reservatum in loco convenienti reverenter ponit in patenam, et corporali parvo plicato cooperit. Finita autem crucis adoratione, reponit crucem in loco suo super altare et accenduntur luminaria circa altare. Postea, obmissa confessione consueta, sacerdos cum ministris ad altare accedit, et ibi preparat calicem cum vino puro cui totaliter preparato patenam cum corpore domini cooperto diligenter superponit nichil dicendo.	Dum supradicta cantantur, palla super toaliam extenditur et corporale a diacono super pallam. Sacerdos vero corpus domini quod pridie fuerat reservatum in loco convenienti, reverenter ponit super patenam et corporali parvo plicato cooperit. Finita vero crucis adoratione, sacrista vel alius ad hoc assignatus reponit crucem in loco suo et accendit luminaria circa altare. Postea, omissa confessione consueta, sacerdos cum ministris ad altare accedit. Deinde diaconus cum ministris abiens in locum dominici corporis ibidem preparat calicem cum vino puro, cui taliter preparato patenam cum corpore domini cooperto diligenter superponit. Tunc ad altare hoc ordine procedunt. Primo procedit unus cum turibulo fumigante, quem sequuntur duo portantes luminaria, deinde subdiaconus portans ampullam aque; post hoc venit

---

[70] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione, Appendix* I, p. 334.

	diaconus deferens calicem cum corpore domini.
	Cum autem ad altare ventum est . . . neutro eorum aliquid dicente.
Quo completo more solito fit incensatio . . .	Quo completo, more solito, fit incensatio . . .[71]

We note here that the two texts are in close agreement on details until the priest arrives at the altar. Then the Franciscan Missal adds an entirely new ceremony in which the deacon prepares the chalice away from the altar and then goes in procession to the altar with the reserved sacrament and the chalice; he is accompanied by the subdeacon and servers who carry lights and the censer. The rubrics go on to tell how the priest receives the Host and chalice from the deacon and places them on the altar; then the water is placed in the chalice. At this point, the two mass books resume their common text with the incensing of the elements. It goes without saying that the composer of the Franciscan Missal did not use the Lateran Missal for these ceremonies which are not found therein. The procession is an entirely new feature; it is not found in the *Ordinarium*. This latter document describes the mixing of the water with the wine but goes on to state that the practice in certain churches is to offer only pure wine on this day.[72] The Franciscan Missal follows the former practice; the Lateran Missal the latter.

Another instance in which these two mass books diverge in their rubrics can be seen in the first series of ceremonies for Holy Saturday. We know from the *Ordinarium* of the Curia that the sequence of ceremonies on Holy Saturday at Rome about the year 1220 was as follows: (1) the blessing the new fire; (2) the blessing of the grains of incense for the paschal candle; (3) the *Lumen Christi* ceremony; (4) the blessing of the paschal candle; (5) the prophecies.[73] In the Lateran Missal, we find (1) and (5) with merely a mention of (4): *completa benedictione ignis et cerei.*[74] In the Franciscan Missal, we have (1), (2), (4) and (5).[75] It is obvious then that the composer of the latter did not find his rubrics for (2) and (4) in the Lateran Missal. And yet when the ceremonies are common to both, we find the same verbal agreement that we have noted elsewhere. For example, we note that the *Ordinarium* states that the *Ite missa est* at the end of the mass on this day is to be said *sine alleluia;* the two missals are in agreement in prescribing the double *Alleluia* at this point.

In view of the two cases just given, we do not see how we can escape the conclusion: Haymo of Faversham did not use our Lateran Missal. It would appear that the similarity in the text of the two books is due to a common source.

Lest anyone might be tempted to suggest that this common source is *merely* the *Ordinarium* of the Curia, or that the rubrics in these two missals are the result of two men working independently of each other, we will give one more comparison of texts in which the rubric of the *Ordinarium* is completely rewritten and the resulting text is found word for word in both missals. We give in the first column the rubric of the *Ordinarium* for the communion and the reservation of the Host on Holy Thursday; in the second column, the corresponding rubric found in both the Lateran and the Franciscan Missals, noting the one single variant (*fratres* for *clerici*).

---

[71] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione, Appendix* I, p. 335-6.

[72] Andrieu, *Pont. Rom.* II, *Appendix* II, p. 561, col. 1.

[73] Andrieu, *Pont. Rom.* II, *Appendix* II, pp. 564-6, col. 2.

[74] See the text in the *Appendix* to this article, *infra* p. 75.

[75] van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione, Appendix* I, p. 336-7.

ORDINARIUM OF THE CURIA:	LATERAN AND FRANCISCAN MISSALS:
Pontifex vero in sede sua communicat illos qui communicare volunt. Reserventur tamen oblate integre de corpore domini in diem parasceven, sanguis vero domini penitus assumatur. Pacis osculum non datur. *Agnus Dei* dicatur et communio *Dominus Iesus Christus postquam cenavit.*[76]	. . . *Agnus Dei* dicitur sed pax non datur. Hodie reservat sacerdos in loco honesto et convenienti unam hostiam consecratam pro die sequenti in quo non conficitur, vel etiam plures si necesse fuerit pro infirmis. Sanquinem vero totum sumit. Deinde clerici (*Fr. Miss.* fratres) immediate communicant, et postea completur missa. Communio *Dominus Iesus Christus postquam cenavit.*[77]

The complete verbal agreement here, and elsewhere, in the rubrics of these two missals, taken in conjunction with the evidence that the Lateran Missal does not depend for its rubrics on the Franciscan Missal, and the evidence that Haymo of Faversham was not using the Lateran Missal, leads inevitably to the conclusion that these rubrics come from a common source. That source is not immediately the *Ordinarium* of the Curia, but a revision of its text to provide the ordinary priest and his assistants with a practical guide so that they might perform the services of the church according to the custom of the Roman Curia. This revision, to which we may give the rather arbitrary title: *Ordo curiae Romanae ad usum sacerdotis accommodatum,* was used copiously by the rubricist of the Lateran Missal and by Haymo of Faversham for his *Ordo missalis* of the Franciscan Missal. We further suggest that this revised *Ordinarium* is the basis for the correction of the Good Friday rubric for the mass of the Pre-sanctified in both the *Ordinarium* and the Pontifical of the Curia. The text of this "priest's" *ordo* has not come down to us in its entirety, but it could be largely reconstructed, so far as the rubrics of the missal are concerned, from the Lateran and the Franciscan Missals. Whether or not its composer did the same sort of work for the rubrics of the breviary, we do not know as we have no evidence one way or the other. But it now appears quite certain that the work of Haymo of Faversham in "correcting the *ordinarium of the missal,*" as John of Parma calls it, was not quite so original as is generally supposed. Without in any way belittling the overall importance of his work in giving the Friars—and eventually the church—an excellent missal, we must give due credit to the unknown cleric who adapted the Curial *Ordinarium* to the needs of a simple priest and whose revision of the ceremonies of Holy Week has been preserved for us in the old Lateran Missal.

We may now state with some certainty the origin and the date of the Lateran Missal. It is the result of a joint effort of two scribes working probably under the direction of a cleric. The aim is to produce a complete mass book for a priest. The first scribe has at his disposal a sacramentary of rather archaic type which apparently came from a church or monastery at, or near, Arezzo. He is content to copy his model without "modernizing" the sanctoral; he inserts the gospel for each day after the collect; in the common of saints, he adds the epistle also. It may well be, of course, that his model was already provided with these features. To the second scribe was entrusted the task of putting together the remaining portions of each mass. He combines an epistolary with an antiphonary; he copies for each day the introit, epistle, gradual (tract), offertory and communion, or gives a reference where these may be found. For the order of the feasts, he follows with reasonable fidelity the arrangement of the first part of the book. Moreover, he had at his disposal a booklet of ceremonies from which he makes copious extracts for Palm Sunday and the last three days of Holy Week. This booklet was a revision of the *Ordinarium* of the Curia in which the papal ceremonies were accommodated to the use of a priest.

---

[76] Andrieu, *Pont. Rom.* II, *Appendix* II, p. 550.

[77] For the Lateran Missal, see text in *Appendix* to this article, *infra* p. 76. For the Franciscan Missal, see: van Dijk, *Il Carattere della Correzione, Appendix* I, p. 333-4.

We must then date the Lateran Missal, as it now exists in Codex 65 of the Lateran Archives, later than 1216—the earliest possible year in which the *Ordinarium* of the Curia could have been written. We must further add some period of time to allow for the adaption of this *Ordinarium* to the needs of a priest. On the other hand we may date our missal before 1240 since it does not depend on the *Ordo missalis Fratrum Minorum secundum consuetudinem curiae Romanae* composed by Haymo of Faversham 1240-1244. Were we to say that the Lateran Missal was written about the year 1230, we should not be very wide of the mark. It was apparently not intended for use at the Basilica of St. John Lateran, but rather for some church or chapel where the "custom" of the Roman Curia was in use.

APPENDIX

THE RUBRICS OF THE LATERAN MISSAL.

Fol. 258^r IN DIE PALMARUM

completa tertia et aspersione aque more solito in tono orationis, sacerdos procedit indutus sine casula cum ministris indutis. Et ramis in medio ante altare positis, a choro cantatur ant. *Osanna filio David. . . .* Deinde dicit sacerdos in tono orationis *Dominus vobiscum.* Oremus, *Deus quem diligere.*

Subscripta lectio legitur in tono epistole. *In diebus illis venerunt filii. . . .* Deinde cantatur pro graduali R. *Collegerunt pontifices. . . . V. Unus autem . . .* vel alius R. *In monte oliveti. . . .* V. *Vigilate et orate. . . .*

Postea legitur evangelium secundum Mattheum: *In illo tempore cum appropinquasset. . . .* Post hec benedicuntur rami. Tunc dicit sacerdos *Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Auge fidem . . . per omnia secula seculorum. Amen.* (*Preface with musical notation.*)

Hic cantatur in tono feriali a choro *Sanctus, sanctus. . . .*

Sequitur: *Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Petimus domine. . . . Oremus. Deus qui dispersa. . . . Oremus. Deus qui mira dispositione. . . . Oremus. Deus qui per olive ramum. . . . Benedic quesumus hos palmarum. . . .*

Hic rami asperguntur aqua benedicta cum ant. *Asperges me* sine cantu et sine psalmis, et incensantur. Deinde dicit sacerdos *Dominus vobsicum. Oremus. Deus qui filium. . . .* Postea ramos palmarum distribuunt et interim a choro cantantur antiphone: *Pueri hebreorum portantes. . . .* Alia ant. *Pueri hebreorum vestimenta. . . .* Que si non sufficiant, repetantur usque ramorum distributio finiatur. Deinde dicit sacerdos *Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Omnipotens sempiterne deus qui dominum. . . .*

Postea fit processio et cantantur antiphone subscripte vel omnes vel alique pro dispositione cantorum: *Dum appropinquaret. . . . Cum audisset populus. . . . Ante sex dies. . . . Occurerunt turbe. . . . Cum angelis et pueris. . . . Turba multa. . . .*

In reversione processionis ad ecclesiam, aliqui intrant, duo ad minus, quatuor ad plus, et clauso hostio stantes versa facie ad processionem incipiunt versa: *Gloria laus* et totum decantant usque *Israel.* Sacerdos vero cum reliquis stantibus extra repetit illud idem. Deinde stantes intus cantant versus sequentes vel omnes vel partem pro dispositione cantoris. Et stantes extra respondent post quoslibet duos versus scilicet *Gloria laus* sicut a principio. *Gloria laus et honor . . .* (*with* **musical notes**) V. *Israel. . . .* Postea intrat processio ecclesiam cantando R.

Ingrediente domino. . . . Ant. *Cumque audissent. . . .* Non dicitur *Gloria patri.*

AD MISSAM. Introit. Epistle. Gradual. Tract.

Passio domini absque benedictione et *Dominus vobiscum,* luminaribus et incenso, absolute incipitur, nec respondetur *Gloria tibi Domine.* Pervento autem ad partem illam que in tono evangelii legitur, benedictio petitur, incensum portatur sicut consuetum est fieri ad evangelium. Similiter fit aliis diebus quando legitur passio.

Off. *Improperium expectavit. . . .* Prephatio *Eterne deus qui salutem humani generis* et dicitur cotidie usque ad sextam feriam nisi in missa de festo occurerit.

Fol. 267ᵛ IN CENA DOMINI

Int. Nos autem gloriari. . . . Et dicitur *Gloria in excelsis Deo.* Lectio ad Corinthios *Convenientibus vobis. . . .* Gr. *Christus factus est. . . .* Et dicitur *Credo in unum Deum.* Off. *Dextera domini. . . .* Et *Agnus Dei* dicitur sed pax non datur.

Hodie reservat sacerdos in loco honesto et convenienti unam hostiam consecratam pro die sequenti in quo non conficitur, vel etiam plures si necesse fuerit pro infirmis. Sanguinem vero totum sumit. Deinde clerici immediate communicant et postea completur missa.

Comm. *Dominus Iesus postquam cenavit. . . .* Et dicitur *Ite missa est.*

Post refectionem sacerdos cum acolito denudat altare legendo ant. *Diviserunt vestimenta mea* cum toto psalmo *Deus Deus meus respice.*

Post hec conveniant clerici ad faciendum *mandatum,* maiores abluunt pedes, tergunt et osculantur minores sicut ordinatum est cum antiphonis et psalmis.

Fol. 269ᵛ FERIA SEXTA IN PARASCEVEN

cum nona cantatur, induantur sacerdos et minstri casulis nigris, si habent, et sine luminaribus et incenso cum silentio ad altare procedant et omnes prostrati ante altare diutius orent. Interim autem ministri unam toaleam mundissimam extendunt super altare nudatum. Completa vero oratione sacerdos deosculato altari ascendit sedem[1] et subdiaconus statim procedat ad legendum et sine titulo sic incipiat *Hec dicit dominus.* In tono lectionis legantur lectiones et in sabbato sancto similiter. *Hec dicit dominus. . . .* Tract. *Domine adiuva. . . .* V. *In medio. . . . Oremus. Flectamus genua. Deus a quo et Iudas.* Qua finita subdiaconus sine titulo similiter legit *In diebus illis. . . .* Tract. *Eripe me. . . .*

Postea dicitur passio; completo passio, sacerdos dicat orationes sollempnes. Completis vero orationibus sacerdos, deposita tantum casula, procedit ad posterius cornu altaris dextrum et ibi accipit crucem a ministris sibi preparatam quam versa facie ad chorum a summitate parum discooperit, incipiens solus ant. *Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit* (*with musical notation*) et ab illo loco[2] in ant. iuvatur in cantu a ministris usque *Venite.* Choro vero cantante *Venite adoremus* (*with musical notation*) omnes se prosternunt. Postea procedit sacerdos ad reliquum dextrum cornu altaris et discooperiens amplius crucem, elevans eam paulisper altius quam primo incipit *Ecce lignum crucis,* aliis cantantibus et adorantibus ut supra. Deinde sacerdos procedit ad medium altaris discooperiens crucem totaliter ac elevando eam tertio altius incipit *Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi pependit. Venite adoremus,* cantantibus aliis et adorantibus ut supra. Postea sacerdos deponit crucem in loco ad hoc preparato ante altare.

Deinde deponit calciamenta et accedit ad adorandum ter genua flectens ante deosculationem crucis. Hoc facto revertitur ad sedem suam et ibi recipit deposita calciamenta et casulam. Postmodum ministri altaris, deinde alii, ter flexis genibus ut dictum est, crucem adorant.

---

[1] Manuscript: *altare; sedem* is demanded by the sense and this is the reading in the Franciscan Missal.

[2] The rubric is written alongside the musical notation containing the words: *Ecce lignum crucis,* so that the *illo loco* refers to this phrase only.

Et interim cantantur improperia et alia que sequuntur totaliter vel in parte prout multitudo adorantium vel paucitas requirit hoc modo: Duo clerici cantant in medio choro versus *Popule meus . . . salutari meo.* Alii cantant *Agios otheos.* Alii respondent *Sanctus deus.* Item primi *Agios yskiros,* alii respondent *Sanctus fortis.* Item primi *Agios athanatos elyson ymas.* Et respondent *Sanctus immortalis miserere nobis. . . . Crux fidelis. . . . Pange lingua. . . .*[8]

Dum supradicta cantantur, palla super toaleam extenditur et corporale super pallam. Sacerdos vero corpus domini quod pridie fuerit reservatum in loco convenienti reverenter ponit in patenam, et corporali parvo plicato cooperit. Finita autem crucis adoratione, reponit crucem in loco suo super altare et accenduntur luminaria circa altare.

Postea, obmissa confessione consueta, sacerdos, cum ministris ad altare accedit et ibi preparat calicem cum vino puro cui totaliter preparato patenam cum corpore domini cooperto diligenter superponit nichil dicendo. Quo completo, more solito fit incensatio a sacerdote dicente *Incensun istud. . . .* Postea lotis manibus, inclinat se ante altare dicens *In spiritu humilitatis. . . .* Deinde erectus vertit se ad populum dicendo *Orate fratres.*

Consequenter dicit in nota consueta absolute *Oremus. Preceptis salutaribus moniti. . . . Pater noster* totum. Respondent *Sed libera nos a malo,* Sacerdos vero, sub silentio dicto *Amen,* in eadem voce qua dixit *Pater noster,* absolute sine *Oremus* in tono orationis misse dicit *Libera nos quesumus domine . . . et intercedente. . . . Maria et beato Michaele archangelo tuo et beatis apostolis . . . per eundem. . . . .* R. *Amen.*

Frangit hostiam more solito in tres partes. *Pax domini* non dicitur. *Agnus Dei* non cantatur neque pacis osculum datur. Sed immediate post fractionem unam partem de hostia mittit in calicem nichil dicens. Postmodum vero antequam duas reliquas partes recipiat, dicit omnia que dicere diebus aliis consuevit, pretermissa oratione *Domine Iesu Christie fili Dei vivi qui ex voluntate patris* quia facit de sanguine mentionem. Quibus receptis et obmissis omnibus que dici solent ante sumptionem calicis, immediate particulam hostie cum vino et aqua de calice recipit reverenter. Facta communione ut dictum est, postcommunio non dicitur sed sacerdos more solito ablutis manibus, revertitur ad medium altaris et coram ipso inclinatus dicit *Quod ore sumpsimus . . .* pretermissis *Corpus tuum quod sumpsi et sanguis* et *Placeat tibi.* Postea dicuntur vespere sine cantu et crux deponitur et denudatur altare.

Fol. 274ᵛ SABBATO SANCTO

hora competenti cooperiuntur altaria. Dicta vero sexta ignis excutitur de lapide et accenditur. Dicta nona, sacerdos indutus preter casulam stat ante altare cum ministris et cum cruce, aqua benedicta et incenso, carbonibusque accensis igne excusso de lapide in aliquo vase, benedicit novum ignem et dicit *Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Domine deus pater ominpotens lumen indeficiens. . . .*

Completa benedictione ignis et cerei, sacerdos et ministri more solito ad altare procedunt et facta reverentia in locis suis sedent. Postea leguntur prophetie sine titulo. Prohpetia I *In principio creavit deus. . . .* (*Then follows the text of the twelve prophecies with prayers.*)

fol. 286ʳ. His finitis, descendendo ad fontes cantatur *Sicut cervus* et dicitur usque *in captivis.* Deinde ad fontes dicitur oratio *Omnipotens sempiterne deus.* Postea proceditur ad benedictionem fontium. Ubi vero non sunt fontes, Tract.

---

[8] The complete text of the *Pange lingua* is given; after each verse is the rubric: Repetitur *Crux fidelis.*

Sicut cervus et oratio sequens et fontium benedictio pretermittuntur, sed finita oratione *Omnipotens sempiterne deus spes unica,* sacerdos, deposita casula, cum ministris ante altare procumbit et alii clerici stant ante altare erecti et cantatur letania in medio chori a duobus clericis, utroque choro idem similiter respondente. Pervento autem ad *Peccatores te rogamus audi nos,* sacerdos et ministri sollempniter induuntur et accenduntur luminaria circa altare de igne benedicto, et pervento ad *Kyrieleison,* letania premissa, a cantoribus sollempniter incipitur *Kyrieleison.*

Quo incepto, sacerdos facit confessionem debitam in loco consueto et ascendens postmodum ad altare, finito *Kyrieleison,* incipit sollempniter *Gloria in excelsis Deo,* et campana pulsantur. Finito *Gloria,* sacerdos dicit *Dominus vobiscum.* Oratio. *Deus qui hanc sacratissimam.*

Lectio b. Pauli apostoli ad Col. *Fratres si consurrexistis cum. . . .* Finita epistola, sacerdos qui cantat missam incipit *Alleluia* et totum decantat. (*Alleluia, Confitemini,* etc., *with musical notation.*) Alii clerici post quemlibet vicem in eadem voce repetunt *Alleluia,* et sacerdos gradatim exaltat vocem. Post tres vices dicitur postea versus *Confitemini* ut supra. Deinde Tract. *Laudate. . . .*

Ad evangelium portatur incensum tantum. Finito evangelio, dicit sacerdos *Dominus vobiscum et Oremus* et non dicitur *Credo in unum Deum* nec *offertorium.* Sec. *Suscipe quesumus domine.* Prephatio *Te quidem domine omni tempore sed in hac potissimum nocte.* Et dicitur cotidie usque ad ascensionem nisi alia assignatur. In hac tamen missa tantum dicitur *potissimum nocte,* et post octavam non dicitur *die,* immo dicitur *sed in hoc potissimum gloriosus predicare.* Infra actionem *Communicantes. . . .* Alia infra actionem *Hanc igitur oblationem. . . .* Et dicuntur tantum usque ad sequens sabbatum inclusive. *Pax domini* dicitur. *Agnus Dei* non dicitur, pacis osculum non datur nec postcommunio cantatur.

Sumpto sacramento a sacerdote, statim pro vesperis incipitur in choro Ant. *Alleluia, Alleluia, Alleluia.* Ps. *Laudate.* Capitulum ymnus et versus non dicuntur. Ad *Magnificat, Vespere autem. . . .* Ps. *Magnificat* totum cum *Gloria* et *Sicut,* et repetitur ant. *Vespere.* Post hec sacerdos dicit postcommunionem. Oratio *Spiritum.* Deinde *Dominus vobiscum.* Postea diaconus dicit *Ite missa est* cum duplici *Alleluia,* et sic dicitur usque in sabbatum in albis, sed nullo alio tempore iungitur *Alleluia* sed tantum *Ite missa est.*

St. Augustine's Use of the Word *Character*

NICHOLAS M. HARING S.A.C.

ST. AUGUSTINE is rightly credited with the doctrine that, if validly conferred, certain sacraments produce in the recipient a lasting, indelible effect which makes their reiteration both unlawful and invalid. It is generally held today that he chose the word *character* to signify this permanent imprint; it is also widely believed that the Augustinian doctrine on *character* was lost for some seven centuries, since ecclesiastical writers failed to discuss or even mention it until the twelfth century. About a century after its alleged rediscovery,[1] the doctrine was still felt to be a novelty, a fact which prompted St. Thomas to the remark: *Characterem in quibusdam imprimi omnes MODERNI confitentur.*[2] St. Albert echoed a similar view when he observed that "in the sayings of the Saints little is found concerning *character* in the sense discussed by the *magistri.*"[3] In addition, St. Albert rejected the definition of *character* currently attributed to Ps-Dionysius and when Duns Scotus opposed the common view that St. John Damascene had defined Baptism as *sigillum* in the sense of *character,* the main patristic foundation of the doctrine seemed to be endangered.[4] For, at the time, surprisingly little was said about St. Augustine's position on this question and if it was at all hoped to claim his authority, Duns Scotus put an end to such hope by stating that St. Augustine distinguished only between *sacramentum* and *res,* but never based the *initerabilitas* of Baptism on an imprinted *character.*[5]

When the Council of Trent prepared a definition of the doctrine against certain errors, an uncertainty regarding its antiquity made itself felt[6] and, when the conciliar decision became known, some Protestant theologians raised violent objections.[7] However, as time went on, Catholic historians succeeded so well in proving that the doctrine *and its terminology* was ancient and patristic that, in our day, even A. Harnack and R. Seeberg[8] agree that St. Augustine used the word *character* to designate a lasting, indelible, spiritual mark on the soul.

---

[1] Cf. F. Brommer, *Die Lehre vom sakramentalen Charakter in der Scholastik bis Thomas von Aquin inklusive* (Paderborn, 1908). F. Gillmann, 'Der sakramentale Charakter bei den Glossatoren Rufinus, J. Faventinus, Sikard von Cremona, Huguccio und in der Glossa Ordinaria des Dekrets', *Der Katholik* XC (1910) I, 300-313 and II, 215-218. G. Pierse, 'The Origin of the Doctrine of the Sacramental Character', *Irish Theol. Quart.* VI (1911), 196-211. Numerous references and quotations can be found in various articles by A. M. Landgraf in *Coll. Franciscana* I (1931), 297 ff., *Rech. de théol. anc. et méd.* X (1938), 40 ff., *Gregorianum* XXVII (1946), 354 ff.

[2] *Scriptum super Sent.* IV, d. 4, qu. 1, a. 1, solutio; ed. M. F. Moos (Paris, 1947), p. 149. St. Thomas discusses the definition of *character* (falsely) ascribed to Ps-Dionysius and the then current *definitio magistralis* of unknown origin. He does not cite St. Augustine in this work. However, in *Summa Theol.* III, qu. 63, a. 5, he makes use of an Augustinian comparison: Augustinus dicit in II *Contra Parmen.*: Non minus haerent sacramenta christiana quam corporalis nota militiae. Sed character militaris non repetitur . . . Ergo nec character sacramentalis deleri potest. In the same manner he treats this text in III, qu. 66, a. 9, stating that Baptism cannot be repeated because it imprints a *character* which is indelible and given with a certain consecration. Therefore, just as other consecrations are not repeated in the Church, so also is Baptism not repeated. Then he adds: Et hoc est quod Augustinus dicit in II *Contra epist. Parmen.*, quod character militaris non repetitur et quod non minus haeret sacramentum Christi quam corporalis haec nota. The quotation is not literal but an accurate summary of St. Augustine's line of thought.

[3] *In Sent.* IV, d. 6, a. 4, solutio; ed. Vivès XXIX, 126.

[4] Albert, *In Sent.* IV, d. 6, a. 4; ed. Vivès XXIX, 123. Scotus, *In Sent.* IV, d. 6, qu. 9, scholium; ed. Vivès XVI, 599.

[5] Scotus, *loc. cit.*: Nec umquam initerabilitatem baptismi ostendit ipse (Augustinus) propter talem characterem impressum.

[6] P. Sarpi (Soave), *Historia del Concilio Tridentino* (Geneva, 1629), p. 246. S. Pallavicino, *Dell'Istoria del Concilio di Trento* IX, 5; ed. Rome II (1664), p. 24.

[7] Cf. Calvin, *Antidote to the Council of Trent* (Edinburgh, 1851), p. 177.

[8] A. Harnack, *Lehrb. der Dogmengeschichte* III (Freiburg, 1890), p. 142. R. Seeberg, *Lehrb. der Dogmengeschichte* I (Leipzig, 1895), p. 292.

I.

St. Augustine undoubtedly taught that such sacraments as Baptism and Holy Orders produce a permanent effect in the recipient, but a closer examination of his terminology reveals that he did not use the word *character* to designate this lasting effect. By misinterpreting Augustinian terminology, P. Pourrat, among many others, concluded not only that the Augustinian doctrine itself was lost for more than seven centuries, but also that St. Augustine was neither precise nor consistent in its elaboration, since he was supposedly unable to decide whether to call *character* the internal spiritual mark or the external sacramental rite.[9] Ignoring the historical sequence of the pertinent texts and depriving them of their context, Pourrat arrived at this conclusion by an entirely unhistorical method and, as a result, his exposition creates the impression that St. Augustine became more uncertain, obscure and confused towards the end of his life. Nothing is gained by Pourrat's statement that St. Augustine "did not indulge in speculation properly so-called about the nature of the baptismal *character*."[10] The very fact that the Saint spent the best years of his life refuting Donatism should be sufficient to cast suspicion on such an evasion of a problem.

In approaching the question, the reader must, first of all, be cautioned not to identify the term *sacramentum* with sacrament the latter of which we are prone to restrict to the outward visible sign of the sacramentary rites. In patristic and post-patristic literature it includes a great variety of sacred things, words or actions to which the word sacrament, as we define it, can no longer be applied.[11] In addition, we must remain conscious of the fact that St. Augustine's language is often highly figurative, reflecting a mass of associations and connotations in a mind which passes rapidly from a thing to its symbol, from an objecct to its illustration.

For instance, on one occasion, immediately after mentioning the *forma* of Baptism, he exclaims: *Non exsufflo vexillum Regis mei.*[12] We may wonder what could have caused him to associate the baptismal *forma* with the *vexillum* of his King. While he was thinking of the baptismal rite, the image of the Donatist practice of re-Baptism rose before his eyes. He saw them performing the detestable ritual of exorcism (*exsufflatio*) to cast the devil out of Christians already sanctified by Christ in their previous Baptism. The image faded away and in its place there arose the vision of Christ's army, organized like the armies of Rome, divided into legions, cohorts and maniples all of whom followed the *signum*, usually the Roman Eagle, to which a *vexillum* was attached. Originally a separate four-cornered flag, the *vexillum* consisted of various ornaments, representations of gods, emperors or generals and was usually carried in the first line. Somehow, in St. Augustine's mind, Baptism was suddenly linked with the idea of such a *vexillum* representing Christ, his King.

From the time of Trajan, the *signum* was often a large dragon, fixed upon a lance, with gaping jaws of silver and with the rest of its body formed of coloured silk. When the wind blew down (*insufflare*) the open jaws, the body was inflated. In this state, the purpose of the dragon was to terrify the enemy and arouse the confidence of victory in its followers.[13] The phrase *exsufflare vexillum* means, therefore, to deflate or collapse the army leader's symbol and thus to deprive it of its effect on both the enemy and its followers.

This brief analysis proves how difficult it is to follow the rapid progression of

---

[9] P. Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments* (St. Louis, 1930), pp. 231 ff.

[10] *Ibid.*; p. 229.

[11] Cf. A. Kolping, *Sacramentum Tertullianeum* (Münster, 1948); N. M. Haring, 'Berengar's Definitions of *sacramentum* and Their Influence on Mediaeval Sacramentology', *Med. Studies* X (1948), 109-146; F. van der Meer, 'Sacramentum chez S. Augustin', *Maison Dieu* XIII (1948), 50-65.

[12] *Ep. XXIII*, 4; CSEL 34, 1, 67.

[13] Cf. O. Seyffert, *A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, transl. by H. Nettleship and J. E. Sandys (London, 1899), pp. 688 and 585.

Augustine's thoughts. But his terminology associated with the Roman army did not end there. It is well known that it demanded of its recruits a military oath, called *sacramentum militiae,* and that when the oath of allegiance was given, a *signum, signaculum, nota* or *character* was frequently branded on the skin of the newly enlisted men.[14] Though little is known about the antiquity of the military custom of branding, there is no doubt that it existed in St. Augustine's time. The same words may also designate a mark branded on the head or the forehead of unruly slaves and prisoners of war.[15] The expression *frontes litterati*[16] suggests that the mark consisted of one or more letters indicating the slave owner. In a similar manner, sheep owners branded their sheep.

The principal purpose of such marks was the identification of the branded person or animal. In the case of slaves, criminals or prisoners of war, the mark would naturally involve a certain opprobrium, while in soldiers it was a sign of pride and honour unless they deserted. Desertion changed it into a mark of shame. Legally speaking, it was the official enrolment that made the recruit a soldier. The mark was then impressed for the purpose of identification to make it possible to distinguish friend from foe in battle, or soldiers from civilians, since uniforms in the modern sense did not exist.

Supposing that the military mark was a sign of honour, it is quite possible that unscrupulous individuals had themselves branded by stealth without formal enlistment or army service. On several occasions, St. Augustine implies that this was actually done and severely punished. He also observes that, after the fraud was discovered, the mark was not erased or changed.[17] Once the crime had been atoned for or mercy had been granted, the mark was acknowledged as legitimate and the soldier was taken over by the army or the commander-in-chief indicated by the mark.

St. Augustine refers to a certain *signum in fronte* so often that it has led to the conjecture that African Christians actually branded their foreheads with a physical mark, the sign of the Cross.[18] This *signum* is not of military but of Scriptural origin and its tradition can be traced back to the earliest Christian writers in both East and West. It is based on the *mark Tau upon the foreheads of the men that sigh,* as we read in *Ezech.* ix, 4, and on the narrative in *Exod.* xii, 7 ff., where we learn that the Israelites were ordered to put the blood of the lamb *upon both the side posts and on the upper door posts of their houses* as sign of protection. The sign *Tau* was conceived as a foreshadowing of the Cross upon the foreheads, while the blood of the lamb foreshadowed the Precious Blood without which no one can escape the angel of eternal death. This *signum in fronte* thus connotes the idea of redemption and predestination and it is, therefore, understandable that St. Augustine does not refer to it when he speaks of heretics. It has nothing to do with either the sacramental or the military *signum* or *character.*

In his controversies with the Donatists, St. Augustine often adopts the word *character*[19] in his writings in the sense of (1) military *character* or *nota,* (2) mark of identification or ownership branded on sheep, (3) and less frequently, designation of the Cross. Since this last meaning is to be classed with *signum in fronte*, we may now consider the first two meanings found in his works. Occasionally, the word *character* is found in Latin Christian literature before St. Augustine,[20] though it had apparently never been used by African writers. As employed by St. Augustine, it is not of Scriptural origin,[21] but derived from a custom of branding soldiers and sheep.[22] Nowhere does he allude to other kinds of branding, such as were practised in certain mystery cults[23] or by slave owners.[24] While branding the face of criminals had been abolished under Constantine,[25] the branding of soldiers was, in St. Augustine's time, extended even further to manufacturers of arms to control the production of war material.[26]

---

[14] Cf. E. de Backer, *Sacramentum* (Louvain, 1911), p. 268; F. J. Doelger, 'Sacramentum militiae,' *Antike und Christentum* II (Münster, 1930), p. 275.

[15] Petronius, *Sat.*, 105: Stigmata . . . captivorum frontibus impressa; *Sat.*, 103: Frontes signans inscriptione. Cf. F. J. Doelger, *Sphragis, eine altkirchliche Taufbezeichnung* (Paderborn, 1911), p. 26.

[16] Apuleius, *Met.* IX, 12; E. De Backer, *Sacramentum,* p. 267.

[17] Doelger, *Sphragis,* p. 33 observes that devices to erase such marks had been developed.

[18] M. Pontet, *L'exégèse de S. Augustin prédicateur* (Aubier, 1944), p. 366 notes: Ce détail d'archéologie chrétienne me paraît sure. G. Morin, *Miscell. Agost.* I (Rome, 1930), p. 89 interprets it as a mere figure of speech but admits that his travel experiences in Africa often made him wonder if it is only figurative language.

[19] Occasionally, he uses *character* or *characteres* designating magic signs or charms. See *Sermones VIII,* 2; and *XVIII,* 2; G. Morin, *op. cit.*, pp. 500 and 615· *De Doctrina christiana* II, 29, 45; PL, 34, 57.

The military mark was impressed on a conspicuous part of the body, i.e., the forehead, face, arm or hand. Although St. Augustine is not very specific on this point,[27] we know that a law of Arcadius and Honorius prescribed the branding of manufacturers of weapons on their arms *ad imitationem tironum*. There is also historical evidence that in certain armies the mark was impressed on the soldiers' forehead.[28]

Of greater interest to us is the question whether the mark consisted in a symbolical representation or in one or several letters. On one occasion, St. Augustine exclaims: *Characterem legite*, which suggests strongly that he associated *character* with letters. This assumption is confirmed by St. Ambrose's remark: *Nomine imperatoris signantur milites*. It is obvious that this name was not written in full but in abbreviated form, and it would seem that the word *character* appeared preferable to *signum* and *signaculum* precisely because the mark consisted in a letter or an abbreviation of a name.[29]

In reading Augustinian texts, we must consequently keep in mind that military *character, nota, signum, signaculum* designate a mark branded on a conspicuous part of the soldier's body. It appears certain that it was an abbreviation of a name, not a symbol. It was a means of identification and, according to military tradition, was never erased or changed into another *character* when impressed without authority. If the branding was done illegally and discovered, the imprinted name of the *imperator* decided the question to which army group the man belonged. The *character* on sheep also served as a means of identification,[30] but it connotes ownership more strongly than military *character*. St. Augustine will occasionally shift the emphasis from identification to ownership according to his design or the type of mark he had in mind, for those identifiable as Christ's soldiers were also owned by Christ, their King and Commander-in-chief.

---

[20] St. Ambrose uses the word frequently. Of special interest is a sentence in *De Obitu Valent.*, 58; PL 16, 1437: Charactere domini inscribuntur servuli et nomine imperatoris signantur milites.

[21] St. Augustine never contrasts it with the *character bestiae* of the *Apocalypse*. One reason for this is the fact that, where the Vulgate reads *character*, the pre-Vulgate versions read *inscriptio nominis* or *nomen scriptum* or the simple transliteration *charagma*. See, for instance, Primasius, *In Apocal.* IV, 16, 2; IV, 17, 5; V, 19, 20; V, 20, 4; PL 68, 893 ff.

[22] The custom was known in both East and West according to W. Dennison (*Americ. Journal or Archeology* IX [1905], 12 ff.).

[23] W. Dennison, 34 ff.

[24] An allusion to the branding of criminals may be seen in the *nota criminis* mentioned by Primasius, *In Apocal.* IV, 16, 2; PL 68, 893D. Ps-Augustine, *In Apocal. homil.* XI; PL 35, 2444, remarks of the followers of antichrist: Accipiunt inscriptionem, notam scilicet criminis, in fronte. Bede, *Explan. Apocal.* II, 14; PL 93, 175C, presumably had this text in mind when he stated: (Augustinus) characterem notam criminis interpretatur.

[25] *Cod. Theodos.* IX, 40, 2; ed. Th. Mommsen (Berlin, 1905), p. 501. Cf. C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Oxford, 1944), p. 203. The law, issued on March 21, 315 or 316, permitted a mark to be branded on the hand or the calf of the leg.

[26] *Cod. Theodos.* X, 22, 4. The enactment, issued on December 15, 398, reads: Stigmata, hoc est nota publica, fabricensium bracchiis ad imitationem tironum infligatur, ut hoc modo saltem possint latitantes agnosci.

[27] In *Sermo CCCXXVII*, 4, 5; PL 38, 1434, St. Augustine (?) says of St. Stephen: Dominus ei characterem non in manu sed in fronte posuerat.

[28] F. J. Doelger, *Sphragis*, p. 34.

[29] Of Greek origin, the word *character* primarily designates an instrument or tool for marking, then the mark itself. St. Isidore, *Etymologies*, ed. Lindsay XX, xvi, 7, defines it as *ferrum coloratum*. At an early date, *character* became synonymous with a written letter of the alphabet. Thus we read in *Liber apologeticus*, 31; CSEL 18, 26, ascribed to Priscillian (d. 385): Hebraicae litterae charactere. Phoebadius, *De Filii divinitate*, 8; PL 20, 47A, speaks of characteres divinarum scripturarum. In the same sense, the word is used by Primasius, *In Apocal.* IV, 13, 16; PL 68, 884A. Primasius also witnesses to the fact that *character nominis* was used to designate a combination of letters, called *monogramma*. In this sense, the word was known to Hrabanus Maurus (*De Inventione linguarum;* PL 112, 1582) and other Christian writers. The very fact that *character* came to designate a letter or a combination of letters confirms our assumption that the Augustinian usage does not imply a symbol such as an eagle or the emperor's effigy but a name in abbreviated form.

Examining St. Augustine's works in their historical sequence, this study intends to prove: (1) that the word *character*, as used by St. Augustine, designates not a spiritual imprint on the soul but the trinitarian form or the external sacramental rite; (2) that the Augustinian equivalent of *character* as used in scholastic theology is *sacramentum*, signifying a lasting effect in the recipient of Baptism and Holy Orders. In other words, to express the doctrine that these two sacraments produce a permanent effect which modern theology calls *character*, St. Augustine uses a different terminology, *viz.*, *sacramentum* or less frequently *sanctitas*, *consecratio*, *baptismus* and *ordinatio*.

II.

St. Augustine was 34 years of age when, in 388, he returned to Tagaste, his mind still preoccupied with philosophy as a means of combating Manichaeism and paganism. At the beginning of 391, he became a presbyter and in 396 Bishop of Hippo. At first, the relations between Donatists and Catholics were friendly and quiet, united as they were in a common front against the Manichees. About the year 392, however, the Donatists became alarmed by a letter of St. Augustine to Maximinus, Donatist bishop of Sinitum near Hippo, who had rebaptized a Catholic apostate, a deacon of Mutugenna. Stunned at what seemed to be only a rumour, St. Augustine tried in vain to contact Maximinus and finally journeyed to Mutugenna where the deacon's parents revealed the whole story. Overcome with grief, St. Augustine wrote to Maximinus and argued: *Rebaptizare igitur haereticum hominem qui haec sanctitatis signa perceperit quae christiana tradidit ecclesia, omnino peccatum est. Rebaptizare autem catholicum immanissimum scelus est.*[1] He cannot bring himself to believe the story and pleads: Kindly write whether you did rebaptize him.[2] Why do you not come forth saying: *Ego unum baptismum novi Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti* nomine *consecratum atque* signatum. Alluding to the Pauline *unum baptisma* (*Eph.* iv, 5), St. Augustine means that he knows indeed but *one Baptism*, namely the Baptism *consecrated and marked with the name* of the Blessed Trinity. He cannot destroy the *forma* given by Our Lord: *Hanc formam ibi invenio: necesse est ut approbem. Non destruo quod dominicum agnosco. Non exsufflo vexillum Regis mei.*[3] Wherever he finds that the trinitarian form was used, he must approve it. He will not undo what the Lord ordered to be done in Baptism. He will not deflate that *vexillum* of his King. Circumcision, St. Augustine goes on to say, is the *seal of the justice of faith* (*Rom.* iv, 11) and was replaced, not condemned, by a more fitting *signaculum*. Supposing a Samaritan joined the Jews, he would not be circumcised again, for there is no place to repeat it. Much less is there a place found in the heart, where the Baptism of Christ may be repeated. Hence if you wish to duplicate Baptism, you must necessarily duplicate the heart.[4]

---

[30] This mark consisted either in a number or in one or more letters. Cf. Vergil, *Georg.* III, 263: Aut pecori signum aut numeros impressit. St. Augustine, as we shall see, speaks of oves . . . signatas nomine.

[1] *Ep. XXIII*, 2; CSEL 34, 1, 65.

[2] *Ep. XXIII*, 3; *ibid.*, p. 66.

[3] *Ep. XXIII*, 4; *ibid.*, p. 67.

Thus the battle was joined and St. Augustine rallied his flock through his *Psalmus contra partem Donati.*[5] He made the Catholics sing or recite:

> Ideo non rebaptizamus, quod unum *signum* est in fide,
> Non quia vos sanctos videmus, sed solam *formam* tenere,
> Quia ipsam *formam* habet sacramentum quod praecisum est de vite.[6]

The following years were devoted to a thorough study of Donatism and, about the year 400, he issued his first extensive anti-Donatist work, entitled *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani libri tres.* Parmenianus, whose letter dates back to 387, had launched a vehement attack on certain doctrines of his fellow Donatist, Tychonius. With great skill, St. Augustine sides with Tychonius and exposes the inconsistencies of Parmenianus' own doctrines and actions. The principal Donatist arguments were basically those of St. Cyprian who had been warned by Rome that the effect of Baptism is based on "the majesty of the Name."[7] Following the order of St. Augustine's work, we may first note a reference to the power of the invocation of God's Name: *Sacrificia ergo impiorum eis ipsis oberunt qui offerunt impie, nam unum atque idem sacrificium propter* nomen Dei *quod ibi invocatur et semper est sanctum, tale cuique fit, quali corde ad accipiendum accesserit.*[8] The sacrifice of the wicked is always holy "because of God's Name" invoked in it. In Baptism, human sinfulness can be disregarded even more, for *it is Christ who baptizes,* not the ministers who are dead through their wickedness.[9] If the Donatist doctrine that God baptizes in place of an unworthy minister were true, would it not be better to be baptized by a sinful minister? Certainly not, but it is always Christ who baptizes.[10]

After disposing of a great many Scriptural objections, St. Augustine examines a sentence in Parmenianus' letter that brings us closer to the object of our study. Parmenianus had made the concession: *Baptismum quidem non amittit qui recedit ab ecclesia, sed jus dandi tamen amittit.*[11]

There are, St. Augustine replies, many reasons why such a statement is false. First of all, no proof has ever been advanced that he who cannot lose his Baptism can lose the right to administer it, for each of them is a *sacramentum: Utrumque enim sacramentum est et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur: illud cum baptizatur, illud cum ordinatur. Ideoque in catholica utrumque non licet iterari.*[12] In other words, *Baptism* is not lost precisely because it is a *sacramentum* and, therefore, must not be reiterated in the Catholic Church. By Baptism, St. Augustine does not mean here the external matter and form, but something lasting beyond the performance of the rites. It endures because the *sacramentum* or consecration remains. The right to baptize is given through Ordination and cannot be lost for the same reason. Hence those who return from heresy are not ordained again, as their Ordination remains as untouched as their Baptism. Whether conferred within or without the Catholic communion, the *sacramenta* remain the same.[13] Even if the Church should consider it more expedient not to allow converts ordained in heresy to exercise their office, the *sacramenta* are not taken away but remain "over them" (*manent super eos*[14]) and there must be no imposition of hands so that injury or injustice to the *sacramentum* be avoided: *Ideoque non eis in populo manus imponitur, ne non homini sed ipsi sacramento fiat injuria.*[15]

---

[4] *Ibid.;* p. 69. The comparison is borrowed from Optatus, *Lib. septem* V, 1; CSEL 26, 120. See also Augustine, *Quaest. in Heptat.* VI, 6; CSEL 28, 3, 422.

[5] Date: 393.

[6] CSEL 51, 12.

[7] Cf. *Epp. LXXIV,* 5 and *LXXV,* 8; CSEL 3, 2. 803, and 822.

[8] *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* II, 6, 11; CSEL 51, 56.

[9] *Ibid.* II, 11, 22; p. 71.

[10] *Ibid.* II, 11, 23; p. 73.

[11] *Ibid.* II, 13, 28; p. 79.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*: Sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra, quia in praecisione fuerit vitium . . . non in sacramentis quae, ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt.

[14] *Ibid.*: Non eis tamen ipsa ordinationis sacramenta detrahuntur sed manent super eos. Cf. *De Baptismo* III, 14, 19; CSEL 51, 210: Illa sanctitas sacramenti verbis evangelicis consecrata super eum integra permanebat.

St. Augustine then goes on to show that not only the ordained but also laymen may baptize although, save in case of necessity, such Baptism is illicit.[16] To illustrate that an action may be at once unlawful and valid, he makes this comparison: *Neque ullo modo per devotum militem quod a privatis usurpatum est signum regale violabitur.* He means to say that a good soldier will not violate the "royal mark" imprinted by civilians or people without military authority. Then he continues:

> Si enim aliqui furtim et extraordinarie non in monetis publicis aurum vel argentum vel aes percutiendo signaverint, cum fuerit deprehensum, nonne illis punitis aut indulgentia liberatis cognitum *regale signum* thesauris regalibus congeretur?[17]

Money should be coined in official public mints. Supposing some forgers struck money and were caught, punished, or granted forgiveness, would the money that bears the royal *signum* or stamp not be placed in the royal treasury?

That these are only illustrations is obvious and generally admitted. More important is the following comparison:

> Aut si quisque sive desertor sive qui numquam omnino militaverit, *nota militari* privatum aliquem signet, nonne ubi fuerit deprehensus ille signatus pro desertore punitur . . . simul secum punito, si eum prodiderit, audacissimo signatore? At si forte illum *militiae characterem* in corpore non militans pavidus exhorruerit et ad clementiam imperatoris confugerit ac prece fusa et impetrata venia militare jam coeperit, numquid homine liberato atque correcto *character* ille repetitur ac non potius agnitus approbatur?[18]

So far St. Augustine has only spoken of military, not sacramental, *character*. Returning to his original argument which, as we have seen, pivots on *sacramentum,* he poses the following question: *An forte minus haerent* sacramenta *christiana quam* corporalis *haec* nota, *cum videamus nec apostatas carere baptismate, quibus utique per paenitentiam redeuntibus non restituitur et ideo amitti non potuisse judicatur.*[19] The previous examples served to illustrate that the Christian *sacramenta* adhere at least as closely to the recipient as *that bodily mark* does to the soldier. St. Augustine states again that *Baptism* cannot be lost, while we would say that its *character* cannot be lost. To avoid any misinterpretation, he insists and cautions that he uses *character* as comparison, (*similitudo*), although he does not specify the exact point of comparison. To justify himself he asks his opponent: did not St. Paul speak of the Christian as *militans Deo?*[20]

The salient point of the discussion is *sacramentum* and the Bishop challenges the Donatists to explain how it can be lost: *Ipsi explicent, quomodo sacramentum baptizati non possit amitti et sacramentum ordinati possit amitti.*[21] So he comes back to the same fundamental reason: if both Baptism and Holy Orders are classed as *sacramentum,* which nobody doubts, how is one *sacramentum* not lost and the other lost? *Si enim utrumque* sacramentum est, *quod nemo dubitat, cur illud non amittitur et illud amittitur? Neutri* sacramento *injuria facienda est.*[22] St. Augustine's primary object is to refute the repetition of Holy Orders. The premise that the *sacramentum* of Baptism is not lost by apostasy had been admitted by Parmenianus. Since ordination is likewise a *sacramentum*, it must be treated in the same fashion. But what is to be done if the *sacramentum* was received outside the Catholic communion? It must not be repeated.[23] And why not? Because the sanctity of the sacraments is above the minister's wickedness. The Name of God cannot be defiled.[24]

---

[15] *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* II, 13, 28; p. 80.

[16] *Ibid.* II, 13, 29; p. 80.

[17] *Ibid.*; p. 80.

[18] *Ibid.*; pp. 80-81.

[19] *Ibid.*; p. 81.

[20] *Ibid.*: An ducenda de militia similitudo non fuit, cum Apostolus de agonisticis certaminibus ducat et aperte clamat: *Nemo militans Deo . . .*

[21] *Contra Epistulam Parmeniani* II, 13, 30; CSEL 51, 81.

[22] *Ibid.*; p. 81.

Faithful to his promise,[25] the tireless Bishop soon published a more elaborate treatise: *De Baptismo libri VII*. First he sums up the previous work, discusses some questions relative to Donatism and then submits the doctrine of St. Cyprian to a thorough analysis. The main argument again hinges on *sacramentum*. The apostate does not lose the *sacramentum* of Baptism nor if he be ordained does he lose the *sacramentum* which gives him the right to baptize:

> *Sacramentum* enim baptismi est quod habet qui baptizatur, et *sacramentum* dandi baptismi est quod habet qui ordinatur. Sicut autem baptizatus, si ab unitate recesserit, *sacramentum* baptismi non amittit, sic etiam ordinatus, si ab unitate recesserit, *sacramentum* dandi baptismi non amittit: Nulli enim *sacramento* injuria facienda est.[26]

Again he clarifies his thought on lay Baptism and declares that he is willing even to concede that we may truly call Catholic a person who is baptized outside the Church in case of emergency and who dies before actually joining the Catholic communion as desired.[27] But otherwise Baptism does not exist lawfully outside the Church. To understand this, the Donatists should look at the illustration (*similitudo*) from military practice:

> Intueantur etiam similitudinem *notae militaris,* quia extra militiam a desertoribus et haberi et accipi potest, sed tamen extra militiam nec habenda nec accipienda est et reducto vel perducto ad militiam nec mutanda nec iteranda est.[28]

As the context shows, St. Augustine intended to exemplify valid but unlawful Baptism by comparing it to the *nota militaris* which is recognized under any circumstances in deserters and in those marked unlawfully by civilians.

After dealing at great length with the doctrine of St. Cyprian, St. Augustine raises the question: is it possible to give a solid reason for the general tradition of accepting heretical Baptism? Yes! Baptism is not the work of man, but of Christ and for that reason must not be repeated.[29] The recipient's orthodoxy of faith is immaterial as far as the question of the *sacramentum* is concerned: *Fieri enim potest ut homo integrum habeat sacramentum et perversam fidem.*[30] All that truly matters is the use of the *verba evangelica,* i.e., the trinitarian form.[31] If so administered by Marcion, Valentinus, Arius, Eunomius, or unworthy ministers of the Church, the sacraments are the same everywhere.[32] But since the Holy Spirit is not found outside the Church, an imposition of hands is required for converts.[33] Is Baptism separable from the Church? Most certainly, St. Augustine replies, for it is Christ who baptizes and He has given this power to no one else.[34] It was precisely St. Cyprian's error to believe that Church, Spirit, and Baptism are an inseparable unit.[35]

---

[23] *Ibid.*; p. 82.

[24] *Ibid.*; p. 83. *Sanctitas* corresponds to *consecratio*, previously mentioned (II, 13, 28; p. 79). God, not the minister, bestows this holiness: Nemo ergo accipit sine dante. Sed quod pertinet ad baptismi sanctitatem, adest Deus qui dat et homo qui accipiat (II, 15, 34; p. 88). Hence even heretical Baptism confers it and the sacramentum is not affected: Et ideo nullo modo esset illius sacramenti violanda sanctitas (II, 16, 35; p. 88). See also *De Baptismo* III, 10, 15; CSEL 51, 205: Ejus sanctitas pollui non potest.

[25] *Contra Ep. Parmeniani* II, 14, 32; p. 86.

[26] *De Baptismo* I, 1, 2; CSEL 51, 146.

[27] *Ibid.* I, 2, 3; p. 147.

[28] *Ibid.* I, 4, 5; p. 150.

[29] *Ibid.* III, 11, 16; p. 206.

[30] *De Baptismo* III, 14, 19; p. 208.

[31] *Ibid.* III, 15, 20; p. 211.

[32] *Ibid.*: Sacramenta tamen, si eadem sunt, ubique sunt integra, etiamsi prave intelliguntur et discordiose tractantur.

[33] *De Baptismo* III, 16, 21; p. 212. He changed his view previously expressed in *Contra Ep. Parm.* II, 13, 28; CSEL 51, 79.

[34] *De Baptismo* V, 20, 28; p. 285.

At the beginning of the sixth book, St. Augustine strikes at the root of the Cyprianic error: St. Cyprian failed to distingush between *sacramentum* and *effectus* or *usus*.[36] Just because the *effectus,* i.e., the remission of sins, was not found among heretics, the *sacramentum* itself was also thought to be wanting among them. But the original custom, afterwards confirmed by the authority of a general council, led the *shepherds* to the conclusion that even the wicked both have and give and receive the *sacramentum* of Baptism.

> so that even the sheep which was straying outside and had received the mark (*character*) of the Lord from false plunderers outside, if it seek the salvation of Christian unity, is purified from error, is freed from captivity, is healed of its wounds, and yet the mark (*character*) of the Lord is recognized rather than rejected in it. The mark (*character*) is often impressed by wolves and on wolves, who seem indeed within the fold, but yet are proved not to belong to that sheep which is one in many.[37]

In the first part of this work, as we have seen, St. Augustine had used the *similitudo* of military *character* without however, determining the precise point of comparison or analogy. He now chooses his illustration from pastoral life but does not tell us again that it is a *similitudo.* The metaphor of sheep and shepherd naturally calls for *character* as the mark impressed on sheep. His theological or technical distinction is still between *sacramentum* and *effectus,* while today we should say that, according to St. Augustine, St. Cyprian confused *character* with grace.[38]

Despite his prodigious literary activities in other matters of the faith, St. Augustine soon[39] published another work entitled *Contra litteras Petiliani.*[40] Petilianus, a Donatist bishop, had made lavish use of Scriptural texts but in St. Augustine he met more than his equal. After a detailed exegesis of *John* xiii, 10, Petilianus states: *Semel est quod habet auctorem: semel est quod Veritas firmat.*[41] To this we can easily anticipate St. Augustine's reply: *Baptismus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti Christum habet auctorem, non quemlibet hominem. Et Christus est Veritas, non quilibet homo.*[42] Sacramental efficacy, he continues, does not depend on personal merits but on the "invocation". At all times, the sanctity of *Christ's name* was of the greatest efficay, even beyond the communion of the Church. In like manner, the sanctity of the *sacramentum* is also efficacious outside the communion of the Church.[43] If the invocation of *Christ's* name is so powerful, who would be so utterly insane as to deny this power to the invocation of the Trinity?[44] For that reason we accept Baptism as holy wherever it is given and do not destroy the Commander's *character*: *Nisi quod vestrum est destruimus. Destruimus enim perfidiam desertoris, non destruimus* characterem *Imperatoris.*[45] In this statement, St.

---

[35] *Ibid.* V, 23, 33; p. 290.

[36] *De Baptismo* VI, 1, 1, p. 297.

[37] *Ibid.*; p. 298: Satis eluxit pastoribus ecclesiae . . . etiam ovem quae foris errabat et dominicum characterem a fallacibus depraedatoribus suis foris acceperat . . . corrigi . . . characterem tamen in ea dominicum agnosci potius quam improbari, quandoquidem ipsum characterem multi et lupi et lupis infigunt.

[38] *Effectus,* as used by St. Augustine and many post-Augustinian writers, signifies Baptismal remission of sins and is distinct from the sacramental consecration and sanctitas, though they all result from the power (*vis*) of the sacrament.

[39] Approximate date: 401-405.

[40] Petilianus, bishop of Cirta, circulated his letter in 399-400.

[41] *Contra litteras Petiliani* II, 24, 56; CSEL 52, 55.

[42] *Ibid.* II, 24, 57; p. 56.

[43] *Ibid.* II, 80, 178; p. 110.

[44] *Ibid.* The argument is typically Roman, based on the sanctity of the Name: Caritatem non habent et unitatem non tenent . . . inest tamen sanctitas nominis Christi . . . recte ergo ipsi nomini non facimus injuriam (II, 81, 180; p. 111). He accuses the Donatists: Sacramentum nominis Christi, quod in eis sanctum est, exsufflatis (*ibid.*).

[45] *Contra litt. Petiliani* II, 108, 147; p. 160.

Augustine establishes a relationship between the invocation of the Trinity and the *character* of the Commander-in-chief. Some ten years earlier, he had written to Maximinus that he would not destroy the *forma*. Now, after discussing the power of the trinitarian invocation, he observes that he would not destroy his Commander's *character*. It remains to be shown that the *character* he refuses to destroy is not a spiritual imprint but the trinitarian form of Baptism or, in the case of Holy Orders, the invocation of the Holy Trinity.

In 401, before the completion of his work against Petilianus, St. Augustine composed his *Epistula ad Catholicos*[46] which contributes little to the clarification of the present problem. However, he observes that, recognizing heretical Baptism as one and the same with their own, the Catholics refuse to do injustice to the *sacramentum* received in heresy: *Nec . . . sacramento quod habent* (*haeretici*) *ulla injuria facienda est.*[47]

Some two or three years after the refutation of Petilianus, he published a reply to Cresconius (406-407) who had taken up the defence of Petilianus.[48] A *grammaticus* by profession, Cresconius cited Scripture rather freely. St. Augustine reminds him gently that it is not quite accurate to quote *Eph.* iv, 5: *Unus Deus, una fides, unum baptisma, una incorrupta et vera ecclesia catholica.*[49] Besides, the very same text proves the falsity of the Donatist doctrine for as the *one God* and the *one faith* is also found outside the Church, the same must be true of Baptism.[50] To illustrate this, St. Augustine draws on both military *character* and the mark (*signum*) branded on sheep:

> Neque enim propterea mutandus vel improbandus est regius *character* in homine si erroris sui veniam et militandi ordinem a rege impetraverit, quia eundem *characterem*, quo sibi satellites congregaret, desertor infixit, aut propterea *signa* mutanda sunt ovibus, cum dominico gregi sociantur, quia eis dominicum *signum* fugitivus impressit?[51]

St. Augustine now remarks that the Donatists were not at all pleased with this sort of illustration, since they were not what they called *ecclesiastica exempla.*[52] He simply refers them to the words sheep and soldier, used in a similar manner by the Prophets.[53] He suggests that one could also choose circumcision as an example saying that if, for instance, a Samaritan wished to become a Jew, could he be circumcised again? No, but his previous *signaculum fidei* would be recognized. Circumcision only foreshadowed the truth that Baptism cannot be reiterated.[54]

Undisturbed by Donatist criticism of his terminology, St. Augustine continues using the word *character* to exemplify his doctrine by comparing Baptism received in heresy to the *character* of deserters: *Ne ipso schismatis sacrilegio perirent, ne baptismum Christi non ad praemium sed ad judicium, non ad salutem sed ad perniciem, sicut est militiae* character *in desertoribus, haberent, praestitimus pacem, praestitimus unitatem.*[55] Again, he does not compare a spiritual mark to a bodily military *character* but compares *Baptism* received in heresy to the military mark in deserters.

When St. Augustine wrote this work against Cresconius, the Emperor

---

[46] It is occasionally called: *De Unitate ecclesiae.*

[47] *Ep. ad Catholicos* 21, 60; CSEL 52, 308.

[48] *Contra Cresconium grammaticum et Donatistam libri IV*; CSEL 52, 325 ff.

[49] *Ibid.* I, 28. 33; p. 352.

[50] *Ibid.*; p. 353.

[51] *Ibid.* I, 30, 35; p. 355.

[52] *Contra Cresconium* I, 31, 36; p. 355.

[53] *Ibid.*: Quod si haec (i.e. the expressions *character* and *signum*) tamquam decipientia formidatis, quia non sunt ecclesiastica exempla, quamquam de ovibus et de militibus in scripturis similitudines noveritis, propheticarum scripturarum quae dicuntur Veteris Testamenti volo aliquid dicere, quoniam in Novi Testamenti nec a nobis nec a vobis rei hujus invenitur exemplum.

[54] *Ibid.* I, 31. 36; p. 355. Cf. *Sermo CCCLI*, 5, 12; PL 38. 1548 and *De Nuptiis et concup.* II, 11, 24; CSEL 42, 276.

[55] *Contra Cresconium* IV, 5, 6; p. 505.

Honorius had already legislated against the Donatists[56] and conditions had become more peaceful. His later anti-Donatist works are therefore less extensive. About the year 410, he sent a brief treatise to his friend Constantinus from whom he had received a letter circulated by the Donatists. The general emphasis is on Baptism as consecrational operation of Christ and on *sacramentum* which no man may violate: *Christi enim est unica hominis in baptismate consecratio. Tua est autem unici baptismi iteratio. Justum est ut etiam in sacrilego non violem quod verum invenio* sacramentum.[57] Both the name of Jesus Christ and His Baptism must be treated with equal reverence[58] and, as St. Augustine continues, it is diabolical to rebaptize Catholics.[59]

Considerably later, in 418, St. Augustine delivered a sermon in the presence of Emeritus, a learned Donatist bishop, which conveys the most adequate idea of the meaning of the word *character* in connection with Baptism and Holy Orders.[60] So far, he had occasionally pointed out that he used *character* as a *similitudo* of some kind and he continued to adopt it despite criticism of the unscriptural nature of the expression. The precise point of comparison or likeness was still vague, however, though there was evidence of a link between the trinitarian form of Baptism and his use of the word *character*. That this is indeed the precise point of analogy is clearly stated in the public address to Emeritus in which he reminds the Donatist dignitary: *Baptismus non est ipsorum sed Christi. Invocatio nominis Dei super caput ipsorum, quando ordinantur episcopi, invocatio illa Dei est, non Donati.*[61] He declares that in both Baptism and Ordination the name of God, not that of Donatus, had been invoked by the Donatists. Illustrating this in his familiar fashion, St. Augustine continues:

> In errante et deserente milite crimen est desertoris, *character* autem non est desertoris sed imperatoris . . . Caeteri a desertoribus *signati* sunt, non tamen signo desertoris sed *signo* imperatoris. Non enim desertor *characterem* suum fixit.[62]

Applied to Donatism, this means that the Donatists did not baptize or ordain in the name of Donatus. And to remove all doubt concerning his terminology, St. Augustine goes on to say: *Quid est quod dico: 'desertor characterem suum non fixit'? Donatus non baptizavit in nomine Donati. Nam si Donatus, quando schisma fecit, in nomine Donati baptizaret, desertoris* characterem *infigeret.*[63] In other words, *desertoris characterem infigere* means to baptize in the name of the deserter, i.e., Donatus. Accordingly, *Imperatoris characterem infigere* means to baptize in the name of or, rather in the name prescribed by, the Commander-in-chief, i.e., in the name of the Trinity. It is quite obvious that St. Augustine is speaking of the Baptismal form which would be the *character* of Donatus if it were changed to *in nomine Donati.* By changing the form in this manner, Donatus would "imprint his own *character*." If he met a person baptized in the name of Donatus, St. Augustine threatens, he would ruthlessly exterminate and destroy the deserter's *character.*[64]

This elucidates previous statements in which he declared: *Non destruimus characterem Imperatoris* or *Non destruo formam,* because the correlative to the deserter's *character* is *character regius, dominicus,* or *Imperatoris.* Donatus, the deserter, as St. Augustine relates, baptized in the traditional manner commanded by Our Lord. Thus, instead of imprinting his own name, he impressed the name or *character* of his Commander-in-chief. And our God and Lord Jesus Christ will not erase His own *character*: *Nunc vero ipse desertor* characterem *fixit Imperatoris sui. Deus et Dominus noster Jesus Christus quaerit desertorem, delet erroris crimen, sed non exterminat suum* characterem.[65] Since, by *suum characterem*, St. Augustine means the trinitarian invocation, he warns that we must carefully probe the faithful observance (*fides*) of the words: In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, "for this is the *character* of my Commander-in-chief": *Iste est character Imperatoris mei.*[66] .This *character* He ordered His soldiers or rather His companions to imprint upon all those whom they would gather in His camp, saying: *Go, baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.*[67] St. Augustine then cites St. Paul's reproachful question: *Were you baptized in the name of Paul?*[68] And explaining the text he has St. Paul say: Pay attention to the *mark* you have received. *Advertite characterem vestrum. Numquid in nomine Pauli baptizati estis?*[69] They received the name of the Trinity, not that of St. Paul, as their *character* and for that reason belong to God: *Dei est quod habet nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. Baptismus Trinitatis Dei est.*[70]

---

[56] On February 12, 405. *Cod. Theodos.* XVI, 6, 5; ed. Mommsen, p. 882.

[57] *De Unico Baptismo,* 2, 3; CSEL 53, 4.

[58] *Ibid.* 8, 13; p. 15: Sicut illud nomen est Jesu Christi, ita et iste baptismus Jesu Christi et utrumque agnoscendum et approbandum . . . ne tantis donis Dei fiat injuria. Cf. *ibid.,* 10, 17; p. 17.

[59] *Ibid.,* 23, 22; p. 23.

[60] The *Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis* and the work *Contra partem Donati post gesta* yield no information on our problem.

[61] *Sermo ad Caesariensis ecclesiae plebem,* 2; CSEL 53, 169.

[62] *Ibid.*; p. 169.

[63] *Ibid.*

[64] *Ibid.*: Ego, quando vocarem ad unitatem, si invenirem desertoris characterem, exterminarem, delerem, abicerem, non approbarem, respuerem, anathemarem, damnarem.

We can see now the full meaning and appropriateness of the word *character* as used by St. Augustine. The completion of the analogy or comparison is to be found in the name. In the case of the soldier or deserter, it is the *signum, character* or *nota* of the commander-in-chief; in the case of Donatus or St. Paul, it would be the name or *character* of Donatus or St. Paul if they imprinted their own names on their followers, i.e., if they baptized in their own names; in the case of Christian Baptism it is the name of the Holy Trinity prescribed by the Commander-in-chief, Jesus Christ. Later on, St. Augustine briefly alludes to the mark (*signum*) branded on sheep. Turning to Emeritus, he pleads: *Diligentius te quaeram. Ovis es enim de grege Domini mei. Cum* signo *errasti. Ideo quaero magis, quia ipsum* signum *habes.*[71] The succeeding comparison confirms the fact that St. Augustine uses *signum* and *character* interchangeably, as we have noted on previous occasions: *Nescis quia desertor de* charactere *damnatur de quo militans honoratur? Ideo te quaero ut non pereas cum signo.*[72] He then refuses to seek the deserter's salvation by doing injustice to his Commander-in-chief through re-Baptism.[73]

The Donatist controversy was now drawing to a close[74] and the heresy of Pelagius had begun to loom larger on the horizon. As a result, sacramental questions were deeply overshadowed by the problems of Pelagianism. In reviewing St. Augustine's teaching relative to our present matter, we can clearly trace one line of thought back to his first utterance where, with regard to the Baptismal form, the assertion is made: *Non destruo.* The study of his anti-Donatist works reveals that he introduced the word *character* as a *similitudo,* principally to illustrate that Baptism is inviolable and must be recognized even if given unlawfully, provided the trinitarian form be used as prescribed by Christ. Baptism is inviolable not only because its lasting consecration was conferred by Christ, but also because the trinitarian form, the *character* prescribed by Christ as Commander-in-chief, is inviolable. Resisting Donatist suggestions to drop what they called a "deceptive" term, he justified its use and, in 418, as far as we can judge from his extant works, elaborated its full meaning with unprecedented clarity.

---

[65] *Ibid.*; p. 170.

[66] *Ibid.*: Attendo fidem in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti: Iste est character imperatoris mei. In this sentence, the word *fides* does not mean faith but fidelity or faithful adherence to the trinitarian form of Baptism.

[67] *Ibid.*; p. 170: De isto charactere (i.e. the trinitarian form) militibus suis vel potius comitibus suis, ut hunc imprimerent eis quos congregabant castris ejus, praecepit dicens: *Ite, baptizate . . .*

[68] *I Cor.* i, 13.

[69] *Sermo ad Caes.*, p. 170.

[70] *Ibid.*; p. 170.

[71] *Ibid.*; p. 172.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid.*; p. 173: Absit, ut cum quaero salutem desertoris faciam injuriam imperatori. Ergo probasti mihi quod habeas sacramentum. Exponendo sacramentum probasti mihi te habere fidem. The expression *exponere sacramentum* means to explain the sacramental form. If it proves to be trinitarian, the "faith" has been observed.

[74] In 420, St. Augustine wrote two books *Contra Gaudentium* in which we find the passage: Nec in desertore violamus characterem regium (*ibid.* I, 12, 13; CSEL 53, 207).

Since, as used by St. Augustine, *character* or *signum* conveys the idea of one or more letters designating the army leader's name branded on the body to testify to the enlistment of a recruit, the word is applicable by analogy (*similitudo*) to another name, *signum* or *character,* the name of the Trinity which, to use Augustinian terminology, the Apostles were ordered to "imprint" (*imprimere*) on all those whom they would enrol in the army of Christ. As in the case of military branding, this may be done lawfully in the Church or unlawfully by those who deserted from the Church. But once it has been *imprinted,* the name is inviolable in the tradition of both the army and the Church. It is not exactly Christ's own name, yet it is His *character* because He chose the name of the Trinity and no other name as mark of enlistment in His army. *Character Imperatoris,* consequently, means the *character* or name that Christ as Commander-in-chief has ordained to be *imprinted* upon the army of his followers. Since *infigere* or *imprimere characterem* means to baptize (in the name of), the entire external rite of Baptism or Baptism itself may take on the aspect of *character,* serving as mark of identification for those properly and validly baptized and the non-baptized, i.e., for trinitarian and non-trinitarian Baptism. It is in this sense that St. Augustine occasionally speaks of *Baptism* being *like* a *character.*

In a certain sense, military *character* or *signum* also expressed ownership. But this point is brought out more clearly in the comparison with the mark on sheep. Thus applied to Baptism, *character* or *signum* implies that the baptized are owned by Christ, no matter whether the trinitarian name was "imprinted" lawfully or not, inside Christ's army or outside, by Catholics or by heretics. From the moment of Baptism, all are God's property: *Dei est quod habet nomen Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti.*

The document of 418 is obviously no revision of St. Augustine's previous teaching. It is the clarification of an idea which was less distinctly expressed and explained in the beginning. There is no change of mind in this last exposition of his doctrine nor in his terminology which has puzzled and misled so many historians. It is well known that St. Augustine was too conscientious not to note a change of opinion. If it is assumed that, in 418, he exposed his doctrine less lucidly than in earlier years, the conclusion must be made that he actually abandoned his former position regarding *character* as spiritual imprint on the soul. However, he is by no means more obscure nor more confused. On the very contrary, he is more detailed and more explicit. His address to Emeritus is the most decisive refutation of the centuries-old assumption that St. Augustine used the word *character* to designate the lasting and indelible effect of certain sacraments.

III.

Do the letters of St. Augustine confirm this conclusion? We have already discussed his letter to Maximinus. In a letter to Emeritus, dated 405-411, he compares Baptism to the *signa imperatoris* that are found on the deserter.[1]

---

[1] *Ep. LXXXVII,* 9; CSEL 34, 2, 405.

Writing to Boniface, about the year 409, he explains that the *sacramentum* of Christian Baptism, even if conferred by heretics, is sufficient for the recipient's consecration: *Quae consecratio reum quidem facit haereticum extra Domini gregem habentem dominicum* characterem, *corrigendum tamen admonet sana doctrina, non iterum similiter consecrandum.*[2] No further explanation of *character* is given. But the reader will note that the expression *extra Domini gregem* leads St. Augustine to a now familiar point of comparison, the mark branded on sheep. The heretical *sacramentum* is valid and sufficient for the recipient's lasting consecration: his error must be corrected, yet the consecration is not to be repeated.

About the same time, St. Augustine circulated a letter addressed to the Donatists in which he links up *character* with Christ's name as a mark of ownership comparable to the letters branded on sheep to identify their owner:

> Vos potius recedite a plebibus pro quibus Christus sanguinem suum fudit, quas ideo vultis vestras facere, ne sint Christi, quamvis eas sub ejus *nomine* possidere conemini, tamquam si servus furetur oves de grege domini sui et quaecumque ex illis nata fuerint, *characterem* domini sui eis infigat, ne furtum ejus possit agnosci.[3]

The comparison is as follows: The Donatists acted like thieves. Their forefathers separated the people from the Church of Christ and, possessing themselves the Baptism of Christ, baptized their descendants with His Baptism. They tried to conceal their theft "under His name", i.e., by baptizing as prescribed by Him. But Christ will punish the thieves, will bring the sheep back to the fold, yet He will not erase His *character* in them.[4]

Being a mark of ownership, *character* is a means of identifying the owner. Applied to Baptism, it is a means of ascertaining if true, i.e., trinitarian, Baptism was given. It is in this sense that St. Augustine expresses himself in a letter to Macrobius whom he reminds of the inconsistency in settling their own schism without recourse to re-Baptism, while continuing to rebaptize Catholics. With your own schismatics, he claims, you acted rightly: Characterem *non solum quem ipse (Felicianus) apud vos acceperat, sed etiam quem alii extra vos desertor infixerat, ipso correcto, violare non ausi sunt, quia* regium *cognoverunt.*[5] In this text, *character* clearly designates some *imprint* that the Donatists did not dare to violate, but were able to verify and recognize as *royal.* They could not verify a spiritual and invisible mark, but they could examine if the true form had been used. On finding that it had been used, they did not dare to violate that royal mark or *character.*

One year before his sermon at Caesarea, St. Augustine declared in a letter: *in eis dominicus character agnoscitur.* As in so many other instances, the exact meaning is not explained, though the illustrations are the same:

> Sic enim corrigenda est ovis, ut non in ea corrumpatur *signaculum* redemptoris. Neque enim, si quisquam regio *charactere* a signato desertore signetur et accipiant indulgentiam . . . *character* ille rescinditur. An non potius in ambobus agnoscitur et honore debito, quoniam est regius, approbatur?[6]

In the same letter, he observes without further explanation: *Non faciam injuriam*

---

[2] *Ep. VIIIC,* CSEL 34, 2, 526. This letter was widely known at least as early as the ninth century. But this passage is not cited anywhere until the end of the eleventh century. P. Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* p. 229 believes that it places *character* in the moral order.

[3] *Ep. CV,* 1; CSEL 34, 2, 595.

[4] *Ibid.*: Sed Dominus et fures punit, si non se correxerint, et oves ab errore revocat ad gregem nec in eis suum exterminat characterem. See also *Ep. CLXXIII,* 3; CSEL 44, 642: Vos (Donatistae) oves Christi estis. Characterem dominicum portatis in sacramento quod accepistis. Approximate date: 416.

[5] *Ep. CVIII,* 2, 4; CSEL 34, 2, 614. Date: 409-410.

[6] *Ep. CLXXXV,* 6, 23; CSEL 57, 22.

characteri imperatoris, cum errorem corrigo desertoris.[7] It seems therefore safe to assume that St. Augustine's correspondents and his contemporaries in general understood the meaning of such terminology without comment.

The least we can say is that St. Augustine's letters do not contradict the evidence derived from the works previously studied and, if a comment is needed, it must be made in the light of his public address to Emeritus at Caesarea, his latest and most explicit exposition.

It is to be expected that St. Augustine uses similar expressions in his sermons and in his commentaries on the Psalms, though the difficulty of dating them accurately impairs to a certain degree their demonstrative value. In his *Enarr. in Ps.* xxi, 31, he develops a thought that occurred in his sermon delivered at Caesarea. He compares the Christian's *body* to a house inhabited by a soul. An inscription on the house tells us that the owner is Christ, our King and Commander-in-chief. From St. Augustine's address to Emeritus we know that the inscription (*titulus*) reads: "Baptism (received) in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."[8] Cannot the owner of the house, seeing his *titulus* or his name written on it, rightly claim his ownership and say to the tenant: *Non poneret* titulos *meos, nisi res mea esset. Titulos meos posuit. Mea res est. Ubi nomen meum invenio, meum est.*[9] Christ finds His name written on the house, the body, not on the tenant, the soul. Will he change the inscription? No, it will remain, but the tenant's life is to be changed. So it is with Christ's Baptism given outside the Church: *Non mutamus titulos aut delemus titulos, sed agnoscimus titulos Regis nostri, titulos Imperatoris nostri.*[10] If we substitute *character* for *titulus*, we recognize the familiar terminology: *character Regis, character Imperatoris* which he previously described as *nomen meum,* i.e., the trinitarian form of Baptism prescribed by Christ.

A comparison with the military mark occurs in *Enarr. in Ps.* xxxix, 1. Speaking of the baptized heretic, St. Augustine exclaims: *Quod enim habet, habet. Baptismus ille tamquam* character *infixus est: ornabat militem, convincit desertorem.*[11] Baptism is *imprinted* or conferred *like a character,* i.e., by "imprinting" a name: a true decoration on a soldier, legitimately marked, *viz.,* a Catholic; a sign of treason on a deserter, an apostate or heretic.

St. Augustine's sermons lead to the same conclusion. To give examples: *Quid facit Christus quando tales convertuntur, qui foris* titulum *ejus baptismatis acceperunt? Ejicit praedatorem, titulum non deponit . . . Quid opus est, ut mutet* nomen *suum.*[12] Again we find that *titulus* is His name and we know now that it designates the trinitarian form of Baptism. St. Augustine claims that there is no need for Christ to change *His name.*

A link between *character* and the sign of Christ's name is established in the following passage in which reference is made to *I Cor.* i, 13, as in the sermon of Caesarea. St. Augustine pleads: *Pasce, serve bone, oves dominicas, habentes dominicum* characterem . . . *Ergo pasce oves ejus ablutas baptismo ejus, signatas* nomine *ejus.*[13] We may repeat that *character dominicus,* applied to sheep, leads St. Augustine's thought to Christ's *name* with which His sheep are marked or signed (*signatas*). This *mark* can be verified by others and, for that reason, the Saint tells the Donatists to check and read the letters, the *character.* Hence, after quoting *I Cor.* i, 13, he turns to them, saying: *Nescitis cujus oves estis? Characterem legite in quo signati estis.*[14] He points out again that, like thieves, heretics attempt to deceive by using the same Baptismal form as the true followers of Christ and by considering their adherents as their own property. In truth they are but God's property.[15]

---

[7] *Ibid.*; p. 37.

[8] *Sermo ad Caes.*, CSEL 53, 172; In domo illa, id est in te (Emeritus), discordia habitabat et in limine titulos pacis figebat. Agnosco titulos, sed quaero habitantem. Lego titulum pacis: "Baptismus in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti." Titulus pacis est, lego. Quis habitet, quaero. Fratrem meum attendo, titulum pacis agnosco. Ipsum et ego habeo. Intrare volo.

[9] *Enarr. in Ps. xxi*, 31; PL 36, 181.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Enarr. in Ps. xxxix*, 1; PL 36, 432.

[12] *Sermo CXXXXVI*, 2, 2; PL 38, 797. Approximate date: 405-411, according to A. W. Kunzelmann, *Die zeitl. Festlegung der Sermones des Hl. Augustinus* (Würzburg, 1928), p. 22.

[13] *Sermo CCVC*, 5, 5; PL 38, 1350.

We have noted above that *character* may also designate the sign of the Cross. This may be gathered from the following texts: *Ab isto signo, ab isto* charactere, *quem accipit christianus, etiam cum fit catechumenus, hinc intelligitur quare simus christiani;*[16] and again: *Nomen Christo dedimus et frontem tanto signo subjecimus: Christianus es. In fronte portas crucem Christi.* Character *tuus docet quid profitearis.*[17] This sign of the Cross or *character* appears not only on the forehead but also in the Christian's heart.[18] Despite the verbal resemblance or rather identity, however, it should not be confused with military *character* or *signum*.

Interpreting *Gal.* iii, 27, in a sermon addressed to the newly baptized, St. Augustine declares: *Sed sunt quidam, qui Christum* solo sacramento *induerunt . . . Nam et multi haeretici habent ipsum* sacramentum *baptismatis.*[19] He tells his audience that heretics have the *sacramentum*, but, having been marked by deserters, they wear the sign of the good King *in damnabili carne.*[20] The context shows that he is not speaking of the sign of the Cross but of some other *signum* which is found on *the damnable flesh*. As far as the *sacramentum* is concerned, he adds, it does not matter where it was received, provided it is Christ's Baptism. Grace, however, may be lost even if received within the Church: *Nam et baptizatus in ecclesia, si fuerit desertor ecclesiae, sanctitate vitae carebit, sacramenti* signaculo *non carebit.*[21] If we recall that the military *signum* or *character* was also called *signaculum*, the argument and its terminology becomes more familiar. However, in the succeeding comparison, St. Augustine returns to his more common terminology which shows that *carere signaculo* corresponds to *carere charactere* and that both have the same meaning: *Sicut desertor militiae caret legitima societate, non caret regio charactere.*[22]

Addressing catechumens in a sermon on the Symbol, he expresses himself in a similiar manner:

> Sed haereticis baptismum non mutamus. Quare? Quia sic habent baptismum quomodo desertor habet *characterem*, ita et isti habent baptismum. Si desertor ipse correctus incipiat militare, numquid audet quisquam ei *characterem* mutare?[23]

The sentence *baptismum non mutamus* may remind us of *non mutamus titulos* or of St. Augustine's question: *Quid opus est, ut* (Christus) *mutet nomen suum?* Expressions such as *mutare baptismum, titulum, nomen, characterem*, all refer to the Baptismal form or external rite which he refuses to change, undo or destroy by re-Baptism.

---

[14] *Sermo XVII*, 3; ed. G. Morin, *Miscell. Agost.* I (Rome, 1930), p. 497. Cf. *Enarr. in Ps. xxx, sermo III*, 3; PL 36, 247: Omnes UNO charactere signantur.

[15] *Sermo CCVC*, 5, 5; PL 38, 1350. Cf. *Sermo XVII*, 3; ed. Morin, p. 497: Velint, nolint, characterem Christi imponere coguntur.

[16] *Sermo CCCII*, 5, 3; PL 38, 1387.

[17] *Sermo CCCII*, 4, 3; PL 38, 1386. Cf.*Sermo CCCXXVII*, 4, 5; PL 38, 1434.

[18] *Sermo CVII*, 6, 7, PL 38, 630.

[19] *Sermo VIII*, 2; PL 46, 839 or ed. Morin, p. 36.

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] *Ibid.* In *Contra Faustum* XIX, 11; CSEL 25, 1, 510, St. Augustine observes that one cannot speak of religion, true or false, unless its members are held together aliquo signaculorum vel sacramentorum *visibilium* consortio. In 401, he warned Petilianus: Discerne ergo *visibile* sanctum sacramentum, quod esse et in bonis et in malis potest (*Contra Petil.* II, 104, 239; CSEL 52, 155) Previously, he had stated that the sacramentum unctionis is holy in genere *visibilium* signaculorum . . . sicut ipse baptismus (*ibid.*; p. 154). These and similar texts prove that *signaculum* designates something external and visible.

[22] *Sermo VIII*, 2; PL 46, 839.

[23] *De Symbolo*, 8; PL 40, 636.

When St. Augustine wrote his *Tractates on the Gospel of St. John,* he used the same terminology. Since the *Tractates* were preached about the year 418, we are entitled to interpret the Augustinian terms as explained in the address to Emeritus delivered in the same year. On one occasion, he makes this suggestion: *Puta te esse militarem. Si* characterem *imperatoris tui intus habeas, securus militas. Si extra habeas, non solum tibi ad militiam non prodest* character *ille, sed etiam pro desertore punieris.*[24] In introducing the sentence by *Puta te esse militarem,* he indicates that he intends to illustrate a statement. Bearing the mark of his commander-in-chief within the army (*intus*), a soldier has every reason to feel safe. But if he becomes a deserter, the same mark will be useless. In fact, it will call for punishment. In a similar way, Baptism is of no avail outside the Catholic communion despite its validity. Moreover, it will call for punishment.

Misleading, if deprived of its context, may be the passage found in the following chapter where St. Augustine addresses a heretic in these words: *Tene ergo quod accepisti. Non mutatur sed agnoscitur.* Character *est Regis mei. Non ero sacrilegus. Corrigo desertorem, non immuto* characterem.[25] This "*character* of my King" is nothing else than the trinitarian form of Baptism which, in the same year, he had defined as "*character* of my Commander-in-chief".

In his commentary on the Epistle of St. John, St. Augustine stresses the necessity of charity in the baptized and warns that, without charity, it is useless to boast: "I have the *sacramentum.*"[26] Without charity, they will roam about like deserters branded with a mark: *Si autem non habet* (caritatem), *characterem quidem impositum habet, sed desertor vagatur.*[27]

The association of the trinitarian form with *titulus* occurs also in the same commentary: *Non deletur baptismus, ne titulus Imperatoris deleatur.*[28] St. Augustine does not enlarge on its meaning and there is no need to demonstrate again that *titulus* is identical with *character.*

Before concluding this study, we may cite a well known sentence in which he asserts that the *sacramentum* of Holy Orders is not lost by deposition: *Manet tamen in illis ordinatis* sacramentum *ordinationis. Et si aliqua culpa quisquam ab officio removeatur,* sacramento *Domini semel imposito non carebit.*[29] No modern theologian would express himself in this manner. Stating the same truth, he would say that the *character* of Ordination remains in the ordained. He would write: *charactere Domini semel imposito non carebit.* Yet such is not St. Augustine's theological terminology. The *sacramentum* as lasting consecration conferred by Christ Himself is the reason he advances to explain why neither Baptism nor Holy Orders can be lost: *Utrumque enim sacramentum est.* Since the *sacramentum* is still in the recipient, it must not be given again: *ideoque in catholica non licet iterari.*[30]

IV.

This Augustinian usage of *sacramentum* designating a permanent and lasting element in Baptism and Holy Orders is one and, strictly speaking, the only reason why the Christian writers up to the second half of the twelfth century did not use the word *character* as we use it today. Truly Augustinian equivalents for sacramental *character* in the modern sense are such expressions as *sacramentum, consecratio, sanctitas* or even *baptismus* and *ordinatio.* This terminology was more or less clearly understood and used from St. Augustine to Peter Lombard and it contained what in the second half of the twelfth century began to be called *character*. Hence the doctrine of *character* as lasting consecration and *sanctitas*, received inside or outside the Church, was never lost with regard to Baptism, though occasionally obscured with regard to Holy Orders. But the doctrine was expressed in Augustinian, not modern, terminology. In other words, Christian writers did not speak of *character* in the modern sense of the word for some seven centuries, because St. Augustine had not used the term in the modern sense.

---

[24] *In Joh. Tract.* VI, 15; PL 35, 1432. Cf. *In Joh. Tract.* XIII, 17; PL 35, 1435: Aliquando enim et desertor terret provincialem. Sed utrum in castris sit et aliquid illi prosit character ille, in quo signatus est, hoc attendit.

[25] *Tract.* VI, 16; PL 35, 1433.

[26] *In Ep. Joh. Tract.* V, 6; PL 35, 2015.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] *Tract.* XI, 7; PL 2035.

[29] *De Bono conjugali* 24, 32; CSEL 41, 226.

[30] *Contra Ep. Parm.* II, 13, 28; CSEL 51, 79.

In point of time, St. Augustine's address to Emeritus at Caesarea is the latest, in point of explanation the most lucid exposition. If, then, our now traditional view on St. Augustine's use of *character* as designating a spiritual, indelible imprint were accurate, it would force us to the conclusion that, in his earlier years, he held a doctrine about which he became more uncertain and more obscure as time went on. So much so that, towards the end of his life, he abandoned it saying that by *character* he meant the Baptismal form. It would thus lead to the (false) assumption that he had lost faith in that lasting sacramental effect which he is supposed to have called *character*. It would and did actually lead to the entirely false conclusion that, for some seven centuries, even the best and profoundest writers steeped in Augustinian theology completely failed to debate the doctrine of, and use the word, *character* in our modern, supposedly Augustinian, sense.

These conclusions and assumptions are based on the false premise that St. Augustine used the word *character* in the same sense as, after a short period of fluctuation, the scholars of the twelfth century began to use it. But expressing himself in a terminology different from ours, St. Augustine spent his best and most active years expounding the doctrine that such sacraments as Baptism and Holy Orders effect in the recipient a certain inviolable consecration and *sanctitas* independent of the recipient's merits, faith, or state of grace. Since this effect is something sacred, resulting from a sacred rite, he often calls it *sacramentum* without limiting, however, the meaning of the word to this particular effect. Somehow, even the "invocation of the Blessed Trinity" remains and hovers over the baptized Catholic or heretic.[31] The sanctity of Christ's name is in them and, for that reason, St. Augustine can write: *Ipsi nomini non facimus injuriam.*[32] And since it is the name prescribed by his Commander-in-chief, he will declare: *Non faciam injuriam characteri Imperatoris,*[33] while on other occasions he will insist: *sacramento non est facienda injuria.*

In Augustinian terminology, "Baptism" is not just the transitory, external rite. It remains and is "not nothing", as St. Augustine puts it, "it is something, something great because of Him of whom it has been said: *'It is He who baptizes'* ": *Baptismus ille etiam in illo qui nihil est non est nihil. Baptisma quippe illud aliquid est et magnum aliquid est propter illum de quo dictum est:* Hic est qui baptizat.[34] This last sentence is indeed the foundation stone of Augustinian sacramentology. *It is He*, i.e., Christ, *who baptizes* through worthy or unworthy ministers, inside or outside the true Church, as long as they use the form or *character* prescribed by Him, the divine Commander-in-chief. Since *it is He who baptizes*, Baptism both as transitory action and lasting effect is final and above human interference. Its form or *character* is inviolable and cannot be destroyed or changed. Its effect cannot be undone by man because the consecration and *sanctitas* which Christ produces in the recipient is a lasting *sacramentum*. Any attempt to repeat it is ultimately an insult and injustice to Christ who baptized and to the form prescribed by Him.

There is no denying that, for many centuries, the knowledge of Augustinian sacramentology was largely restricted to what is contained in the *Tractates on St. John.* The strange disappearance of his anti-Donatist works accounts for centuries of vagueness concerning valid Ordinations which led to the great confusion of the Gregorian Reform period.[35] It was then that a vigorous discovery and revival of Augustinian sacramentology began, though it would seem that the choice of the word *character* in the modern sense was not even inspired by St. Augustine. At least, no such claims were made by those who began to use it as we use it today. In fact, as far as the use of the word *character* in the new sense is concerned, we can agree with St. Albert, St. Thomas and others who state that it could not claim great antiquity, though the doctrine itself was clearly formulated, if not in every detail, by St. Augustine.

---

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Contra litt. Petil.* II, 81, 180; CSEL 52, 112.

[33] *Ep. CLXXXV*, 10, 43; CSEL 57, 37.

[34] *In Joh. Tract.* VI, 14; PL 35, 1432.

---

[35] When, at an early date, Eugippius compiled his *Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini* (CSEL 9, 34 ff.), he inserted some extracts from *De Baptismo* and completely neglected the other anti-Donatist works. The first literary use of *De Baptismo* that I have been able to identify is found in Agobard (d. 840-841), *De priv. et jure sacerd.*, 15; PL 104, 143A. He did not copy it from Eugippius. At the beginning of the next century, five centuries after its composition, I have met with the first quotation from Augustine's *Contra Ep. Parmeniani* in Auxilius, *De Ordinationibus*, 21; PL 129, 1067CD. I have found no evidence of the literary use of *Contra Cresconium* and *Contra litt. Petiliani* before Ivo of Chartres (d. 1116), i.e. seven hundred years after they were written. Concerning Augustinian extracts containing the expression *character*, I have discovered but two up to the middle of the eleventh century. The first occurs in Isidore, *De Ecclesiasticis officiis* II, 25, 10; PL 83, 822D, copied from *In Joh. Tract.* VI, 16; PL 35, 1433. The second is found in Leidrad of Lyons, *Liber de sacr. baptismi*, 6; PL 99, 863B, copied from Augustine, *De Symbolo sermo ad catech.*, 8; PL 40, 636. Towards the end of the eleventh century, extracts containing the word *character* become more frequent, but for another century no explanation of the term is attempted. Of the highly important *Sermo ad Caes. eccl. plebem* which provides the clearest exposition of the meaning of *character* as understood by St. Augustine I have found no trace at all. To the best of my knowledge, it was not quoted or discussed before the fifteenth century. Only one manuscript of this sermon is extant, of recent date (13th century), and of so little value that the CSEL text had to be based on the Frobenius edition (Basel, 1569).

The Irish Counterparts of the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium*

JOHN HENNIG

IN his preface to the Bradshaw Society edition of the *Félire Oengusso*,[1] Whitley Stokes wrote:

> Only five metrical martyrologies are known to me, *viz.*: Baeda's Martyrologium Poeticum (which at March 17 contains the line *Patricius Domini servus conscendit ad aulam*), the Martyrologium Wandalberti, the Anglo-Saxon Menologium Poeticum, the Martyrology of Gorman, and the Martyrology of Oengus. The first two are in Latin hexameters, (the last two) in the Irish metre called *rinnard*.

It has been shown elsewhere[2] that the later tradition of "metrical martyrologies", entirely in Irish, was disregarded by Stokes. Even for the period up to the twelfth century, Ireland's place in the tradition of "metrical martyrologies" was but imperfectly outlined in the editor's note. It was not surprising that he did not refer to the *Félire Adamnáin*,[3] first published when he wrote his note, and the poem *Enlaith betha*, unpublished until Best-Lawlor's edition of the *Martyrology of Tallaght*.[4] What was surprising was that Stokes did not mention (1) the twelfth-century poem of the leading saints of Ireland by Cuimmín Conneire.[5] He himself had produced the first scholarly edition[6] and, by his index of saints' feast-days, had suggested that it should be considered in the tradition of calendars of saints; (2) the calendar in Latin hexameters in *Ms.* Br. Mus., *Galba* A xviii and parallels.[7] Stokes had pointed out the inadequacy of the only edition of this work in a discussion of its Irish associations.[8] Of its close relationship with Baeda's *Martyrologium poeticum*[9] Stokes seems to have been unaware.

Stokes still maintained the mediaeval ascription to Bede of this latter work and erroneously assumed that the entry relating to St. Patrick belonged to the original version. To his remark on this entry, Stokes added the following footnote: "So in Baeda's prose Martyrology, at March 17, *in Scotia S. Patricii confessoris.* And yet a writer who ought to know better, asserts that Baeda 'studiously ignored S. Patrick'." Whether Bede "studiously ignored St. Patrick" or not, the fact remains that in his prose martyrology the entry *In Scothia, natale Patricii* is an insertion found for the first time in *Mss Palat.* 834, 833 and *Veron.* LXV.[10] In the *Martyrologium poeticum*, the entry for St. Patrick in *Mss R* and *S* is among the (later) "Celtic influences".[11]

In his 1880 edition, Stokes had described the *Félire Oengusso* as a "calendar of church festivals".[12] This description is obviously wrong, because this work has entries for every day and, on most days, *several* entries, and also because it includes numerous saints which never enjoyed liturgical cultus (in Bishop's terminology "martyrological" rather than "sacramental" saints). In reality, this work is the most outstanding document of that type of devotional literature developed by the Old Irish Church because its liturgy had no *Sanctorale*.[13] For his 1905 edition, Stokes chose the title "The Martyrology of Oengus". Oengus himself used the term *martarlaic* only with regard to one of his sources (Eusebius),[14] describing his own work as one of the *félire* of the Gaels. While endeavouring to bring the tradition of Irish *félire* in line with *martiroloig* and *kalendar*, Mael-Muire Úa Gormáin carefully reserved the latter terms for the non-Irish sources (a point entirely missed in Stokes' translation).[15]

---

[1] Henry Bradshaw Society, XXIX (1905), p. xxxix.

[2] See my note on Egerton 185, *Eigse*, VI (1950), 257 ff.

[3] J. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland* I (New York, 1929), n° 225, iii. Literary references listed by Dr. Kenney are not repeated in this paper.

[4] Henry Bradshaw Society, LXVIII (1929), pp. 84-7, a marginal note at the beginning of both the *Book of Leinster* and the Brussels manuscript, 5100-4.

[5] Kenney, *op. cit.*, n° 274.

[6] *Zeitschrift für keltische Philologie*, I (1897), 66 ff.

[7] Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 481, and my own observations on Hampson's edition to appear in *Scriptorium*, 1953.

[8] *Academy*, June 29, 1895.

[9] Inadequate though it be, Quentin's remark has never been followed up: Plusieurs vers y [in *Ms Galba* A xviii etc.] sont emportés à notre martyrologe [*Poeticum*]. *Les Martyrologes historiques* (Paris, 1908), p. 121, n. 6.

[10] Quentin, *op. cit.*, p. 150. On the other hand, the entry for St. Brigid was made only in *Ms O.*

[11] Wilmaert, 'Un temoin anglo-saxon du calendrier métrique d'York', *Revue Bénédictine*, LXI (1934), 44. In spite of its local associations, the fact that the original version of the *Martyrologicum poeticum* (in *Ms Vesp.* B. vi) does not represent a liturgical calendar of York (or Rippon) cannot be fully understood without reference to Irish parallels, particularly to the *Félire Oengusso*, which work is obviously not a list of liturgical feasts observed at the church of Tallaght.

In describing the Anglo-Saxon poem in *Ms* Br. Mus., *Tib.* B i, fols. 112^a-114^b as *Menologium*,[16] Hickes perhaps meant to express the incomparability of this work with the martyrologies and calendars of the Western Church. However, in 1830 Samuel Fox described it as *Menologium* seu *Calendarium*, adding the even more ominous subtitle "*the* poetical calendar of *the* Anglo-Saxons". Stokes' description of this work as *Menologium poeticum* is a further misleading contraction of Fox's *Menologium* seu *calendarium poeticum* (Hickes had said *Menologium elegantissimum*). Apart from the tentative study published ninety years ago by F. Piper under the title *Die Kalendarien und Martyrologien der Angelsachsen* (in the body of his work however termed "Die Martyrologien und Festordnungen d.A."!),[17] no study, except perhaps Imelmann's thesis, other than from the point of view of language and secular literature has been devoted to this work. Following Aelfric's distinction between saints *quos gens ista caelebre colit cum veneratione festi diei* and saints *quos non vulgus sed coenobite officiis venerantur*,[18] Piper[19] suggested that the "popular calendar" was reflected by Aelfric's *Passiones*, the *Menologium* and Bede's homilies, and the "monastic calendar" by the *Martyrologium poeticum*, Aelfric's Anglo-Saxon homilies and the calendars in *Mss.* Br. Mus., *Tib.* D xxvii and *Vit.* E xvii. The comparison—a most obvious one for linguistic reasons—between the *Menologium* and the Old-English *Martyrology*[20] was never drawn, and even less has the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* been compared with its obvious Irish counterparts, the *Félire Adamnáin* and the poem *Enlaith betha.*

One reason for the absence of studies in this field can be clearly stated from the personal experience of the present writer: there is no real home for such studies. While decrying such studies in that they lack sound philological foundation, the linguists have done little to proceed to a literary evaluation of these texts. On the other hand, the literary investigators, in particular the liturgists, fight shy of regions in which they cannot claim first-hand linguistic knowledge. Fox's work, now more than 120 years old, has remained the only complete translation of the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* into a modern vernacular.

The two best known aspects of the *Menologium* are that it preserved the Anglo-Saxon names of the months and that it contains lovely descriptions of nature in the different seasons.[21] Considering that, except for Irish *féliri*, this is the only "metrical calendar" in a vernacular[22] of the early Middle Ages, we should also mention the repeated references made in this work to *Brytene*, especially in connection with the feasts of Saints Gregory and Augustine and with Christmas-tide.[23] Non-liturgical feasts such as Twelfth Night, Midsummer-day and *hlafmässan*, as well as the winter solstice opening the *haliga tiid dha man haeldan sceal spa bebugedh gebod ceond bryten ricu sexna kyninges*, rank between the high feasts of God and the Apostles. Easter (*drihtness aerist; Félire Oengusso: asreracht Issu*) and the Ascension (*drihtnes stige;* Oengus: *fris-r-ocaib Fiada*, Mael-Muire Ua Gormain: *fresccabail Crist*) are of course assigned to fixed dates.

---

[12] Kenney, *op. cit.*, n° 272. In his 'Die Abfassungszeit des Felire von Oengus', *Zeitschrift für keltische Philologie*, VI (1907), 6 ff., Thurneysen referred to the sub-title of Stokes' Bradshaw Society edition: The Martyrology of Oengus, but described this *félire* as a 'Heiligenkalendar'.

[13] See my articles: 'A Feast of All Saints of Europe', *Speculum*, XXI (1944), 47-66; 'The Meaning of All the Saints', *Mediaeval Studies*, X (1948), 147-61; 'A List of Irish Saints in Rawl. 484', *Eigse*, VI (1949), 50-5; 'Studies in the Liturgy of the Early Irish Church', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* V, 75 (1951), 318-33 and *supra*, note 2.

[14] *Epil.* 140 and 143. Cf. Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 480, note 342.

[15] *Félire húi Gormáin*, Henry Bradshaw Society, IX (1895), p. 4 f., and Kenney, *op. cit.*, n° 275.

[16] Literary references in *Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature* I (1940), p. 79 f.

[17] Berlin, 1862.

[18] H. Wamley, *Antiquae literaturae septentrionalis liber alter* (Oxford, 1705), p. 186.

[19] *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

[20] *Ms.* Br. Mus., *Jul.* A x and parall.; ed. G. Hertzfeld, EETS CXVI (London, 1900).

It is quite obvious that the primary object of this work is not to give detailed and exact information on the place and sequence of liturgical feasts, but to give a bird's-eye view of the Christian year (in itself a matter supposed to be well known)[24] interwoven with the natural order of time in months and seasons.

In this respect, the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* is closely related with the *Félire Adamnáin*. This work has come down to us in a fifteenth-century manuscript (Royal Irish Academy 23. P. 3, fol. 19^{a}) and three later ones that attribute it to either St. Ciaran or to Cormac Naomtha MacCuoillionain under the title: *Félire Adamnáin dia mathair.* Miss Byrne described it as "not an uncommon form of Irish prayer". Indeed the beginning of this prayer of indirect invocation:[25]

Noimh nac ceithre raithe	The saints of the four seasons
dutracht lim a nguidhe.	There is desire on me of their prayer.
Ronsaerat ar phiana,	May they save me from pain,
noimh na bliadhne huile	The saints of the whole year

immediately reminds us of the "Prologues" of the *Félire Oengusso*:

A Íssu not-guidiu	O Jesus, I beseech Thee,
ar écnairc na slógsa	through the intercession of the hosts
cech laithi isin blíadain	of each day . . in the year.
(Prol. 265 f., 281, 288).	
Rom-sóerae, a Íssu,	Mayst Thou save me, o Jesus,
ar cech ulc (Epil. 441 f.)	from every evil,
Rom-snádat i pardus	May convoy me into paradise
ind rígrad imrordus (563 f.)	the kingfolk I have commemorated.

The *Félire Adamnáin* devotes one quatrain each to the feasts of "glorious spring", of "God's fosterling", Brigid, Gregory and Patrick, the saints of "dry[26] summer" (unspecified), of "beauteous autumn", namely Mary and Michael, and of winter: "May they be with me against the *drong demhna* (host of demons)", a clear reference to the Twelve Nights. Thus we see, only five saints, or possibly seven feasts, are actually mentioned. However, the last lines make it quite clear that this is a devotion to all the saints:

Aitcim naoim in talman	I beseech the saints of the earth,
Aitchim aingle ile . . .	I beseech all the angels . . .

---

[21] See G. K. Anderson, *Literature of the Anglo-Saxons* (London, 1949), p. 203, and K. M. Warren, *A Treasury of English Literature* (London, 1908), p. 71 f.

[22] See my article on the Calendar of Cashel: *Scriptorium*, VI (1952), 101 f.

[23] In reference to the unmistakable nationalism of the Irish martyrologies, it is important to note that the saints were reckoned to the nation among whom they labored rather than to the nation from which they originated. See my article 'Britain's Place in the Early Irish Martyrologies' to appear in *Medium Aevum*.

[24] The unusual computation of dates (Cf. Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 56 f.) already makes the *Menologium* quite unsuitable for instruction on the dates of feasts. See *infra*, note 47.

[25] See my article 'Moses in Ireland', *Traditio*, VII (1951), 241.

[26] On the significance of these adjectives (*aeris qualitates*) in 'calendars' of this kind, see *infra*, note 43.

In spite of the vast difference in scope and number of saints between the *Félire Oengusso* and the *Félire Adamnáin*, the words used in the former[27]—that of the "more than thousands of thousands" of saints "only the kings of those hosts" could be "brought forward" (*tucsam*)—also apply to the latter.

The *Félire Adamnáin* is but one of the many illustrations of the literary influence of the *Félire Oengusso*. Bishop pointed out that the Irish entries in the calendar contained in *Ms Galba* A xviii and parallels (the most significant group of additions made in these works to the *Martyrologium poeticum*) were far more numerous than had been stated by Stokes,[28] and suggested that the main source of these entries was the *Félire Oengusso*.[29] This suggestion has never been followed up and the striking relationship in scope and lay-out between the *Martyrologium Wandalberti* and the *Félire Oengusso* has never been mentioned.

In his brief account of *Martyrologium Wandalberti*, Dom Quentin had said of that *martyrologe en vers*: *La vogue était alors à ce genre d'ouvrages.*[30] However, it was Stokes (in the note quoted at the beginning of this paper), rather than Quentin,[31] who pointed out the works representative of this "fashion". The main shortcoming of Stokes' note consisted not so much in its incompleteness and incorrectness in detail, but in its failure to assess Ireland's place in this tradition. That "fashion" of "metrical martyrologies" was particularly remarkable when we consider that these versifications were undoubtedly unofficial (or in Bishop's terminology "unpractical"), a point particularly well illustrated by the Irish entries in foreign works. These entries have been shown in many instances to be due to private preference.[32]

The only attempt to suggest the special place of Irish works in the tradition of "metrical martyrologies" was made in the introduction to the chapter: "General Treatises on the Saints" in Dr. Kenney's *Sources*:[33]

> Prominent among these (treatises) are the calendars and martyrologies, which were primarily liturgical documents for practical use as tables of the festivals of the year. But they also served as historical catalogues, or as epitomes of hagiography. This is especially the case with the Irish metrical martyrologies, which were intended to be memorised and recited by the devout Christian as the honour-roll of the history of the Church. It is from this point of view that they have the greater interest to-day, and are therefore catalogued here, rather than with the liturgical documents to which, in one sense, they more properly belong.

However, in that chapter devoted to martyrologies, calendars and Breviary lessons, to liturgical, historical and devotional works in metre and in prose, in Latin and Irish, of Irish, English, Scottish or Continental origin—all arranged in a most debatable historical order—Dr. Kenney would appear to have missed the decisive point in the assessment of the Irish metrical martyrologies as source material for the early Irish church history. These works form the most compact group of documents that illustrate the "fashion" in "versified martyrologies"; they are decidedly not liturgical but devotional, fulfilling a need that is peculiar to Ireland.

The metrical works which should have been considered together are, in tentative chronological order, the *Félire Oengusso*, the *Félire Adamnáin*, Cuimmín's poem, the poem *Enlaith betha* and the *Félire húi Gormáin*. The obvious bridge between these Irish poems on the saints and similar Latin works is the "calendar" in *Mss Galba* A xviii and *Tib.* B v, which illustrates the relationship not only between Irish and Continental works of this kind but also between computatistic and devotional calendars in this field.[34] In contrast to the three other Irish works, the *Félire Oengusso* and the *Félire húi Gormáin* have rigidly but one entry for each day; so also has the calendar in *Galba* A xviii and parall. in contrast to the *Martyrologium poeticum.*

---

[27] *Epil.* 25-32.

[28] See *supra*, note 8.

[29] *Liturgica historica* (1918), p. 225. This fundamental reference was not listed by Dr. Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 481.

[30] *Op. cit.*, p. 396.

[31] See *supra*, note 9.

[32] See *supra*, note 22 and my review of Dom Munding's edition of the calendars of St. Gallen, *Irish Historical Studies*, VII (1951), 205 f. The Irish entries in the Karlsruhe Bede, Kenney, *op. cit.*, p. 481, are another case in point.

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 478.

Whether complete (i.e., with one entry for each day) or selective, the *félire* was fundamentally a devotion to all the saints, supplementing their commemoration (to this day) in every Mass. This supplementing by calendaric works was called forth by the absence of a *Sanctorale* in the Irish liturgy.[35] The Irish refused to introduce the Western conception of linear historical time into the liturgy. Irish devotion to the saints was based on the conception of internal time (such as underlies Votive Masses) and of cyclical natural time (such as underlies the earliest feasts of the Blessed Virgin). The quatrains of the *Félire Oengusso* were not meant to be recited each on its specific date, but the whole work was to be recited on any day right through. The repetition of the first word(s) at the end, a characteristic feature of Irish poetry, was of special significance in the *félire*:[36] like the Rosary, the devotion itself was cyclical.

The idea of devotion to the saints in the cyclical order of natural time is illustrated by the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium*, the *Félire Adamnáin* and the poem *Enlaith betha*. These works consider the saints in the course of the season. In his chapter on the contents of the *Félire Oengusso*, Stokes complained that "in all this long composition there is no trace of imaginative power or of observation of nature".[37] Obviously inspired as it is by the *Félire Oengusso*, the *Félire Adamnáin* seems to be an attempt to supplement this want by treating of *naimh nac ceithre raithe* (the saints of the four seasons).[38]

The development of the *félire* in this respect should be compared with the development of European painting from early Byzantine art to the Cinquecento. The *Félire Oengusso* and the *Martyrologium poeticum* represent archaic stereotypes removed from nature.[39] The poem *Enlaith betha* illustrates the overgrowing of the devotional function of the *félire* by a sense of nature.

An intermediary stage in this development can be seen in the "calendars" in *Mss Galba* A xviii, etc. where the calendaric bodies of each month are prefaced and followed by verses relating to the zodiacal signs. In the Lebar Brecc manuscript of the *Félire Oengusso*, the quatrains for each month are prefixed by similar notes in prose.[40] In *Ms Galba* A xviii entries relating to the zodiacal signs—about the middle of the month one each of these takes the place of an entry for a saint—are in red, as are otherwise only the entries for the Epiphany and for Christmas. In *Ms Tib.* B v,[41] where this calendar is followed by Bede's treatise *De Temporibus* and several astronomical tracts, majuscles are used for feasts liturgically observed; coloured majuscles for the entries relating to the zodiacal signs and the beginnings of the seasons, and also for the entries for 20/6 (solstice), 7/9 (Pleiades) and for 5/6. To this latter entry I shall refer presently. On the days where *Ms Galba* A xvii has zodiacal entries, Wandelbert attaches such entries to commemorations of saints.

---

[34] *Liturgical Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford, 1952), p. 44 f.

[35] See *supra*, note 13.

[36] The *Félire Oengusso* concludes with a repetition of the (original) beginning (Prol. 21). At the end of Cuimmin's poem, we find the word *Carais*, referring us back to the opening words. The last two verses of the *Enlaith betha* conclude with the letter *.E.*, standing of course for the first word of the poem.

[37] Ed. Henry Bradshaw Society, p. xlvii.

[38] The distinction of four (rather than two) seasons indicates the lateness of this work. See my article, *Speculum* XXI, 37 ff.

[39] The function of such stereotype has not been appreciated in regard to the *Félire Oengusso* (Stokes, *loc. cit.*) nor to Wandelbert's *Martyrologium* (M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lat. Literatur des Mittelalters* I, p. 557 ff.), and Loeffler, *Cath. Encyclop.* X, p. 546. This is one of the many points in which the deeper strata of devotional life have been preserved against the steady growth of intellectualism, not only in the old Irish church but right down to the present day. See my article, 'Katholisches Irland, heute and morgen', *Schweizer Rundschau*, XLVIII (1948), 500-4.

[40] Ed. Henry Bradshaw Society, p. xviii f.

[41] See my article on these manuscripts to appear in *Scriptorium*, 1953.

This interspersing of commemorations of saints with entries relating to the zodiacal signs and the seasons cannot be understood from the viewpoint of devotion to the saints in the order of linear historical time. The idea is, of course, that, similar to the constellations, the saints ascend and descend in the liturgy which, just as the transition from the last day after Pentecost to the first Sunday in Advent to this day shows, is annular. Christ moves through His saints as does the sun through the zodiacal signs.

Wandelbert attached a separate poem to his *Martyrologium*: *De Duodecim mensium nominibus, signis aerisque qualitatibus.*[42] The *Menologium* has the Anglo-Saxon names of the months; the *Félire Oengusso* supplied us with the inflected forms of the Old Irish names of the months. We have already referred to the place occupied by the zodiacal signs in the tradition of the *félire. Aeris qualitates* are referred to in the *Menologium,* the *Félire Adamnáin* and the *Félire Oengusso* (30/6, 1/9 and 1/11).[43] Wandelbert referred in the opening lines for most months (also 9/5) to climatic, vegetational and agricultural conditions. *Mss Tib.* B v and *Jul.* A vi are early examples of calendars embellished with illustrations of the seasons.[44]

In *Ms Galba* A xviii, etc., the entry for 5/6 reads: *Hic prepides temptant avida concludere rostra.* Stokes[45] pointed out that the use of short-*e* for *-ae* in *praepites* was a sign that the Latinity of this calendar was Irish rather than Anglo-Saxon. (It is outside the scope of the present paper to study the peculiar vocabulary, illustrated by this word, of the Latin hexametrical calendars; such a study would establish the connection of these works and should then be co-ordinated with a similar study of the equally artificial and stereotype[46] vocabulary of the Irish *féliri*). What in *Ms Galba* A xviii, etc., is a startling and isolated entry has been the basic idea of the poem *Enlaith betha* ("The birds of the world"). Just as in sixteenth-century painting holy subjects begin to be crowded out by perspective or interiors, so in this poem the fact that:

hi noin enair[47] congair a sluaig	on the nones of January, the cry
din chaill cheir	of the host from the dark wood

is more important than the fact that this is the (Vigil of the) Epiphany. Concerning March 25—one of the most important dates in the old Irish calendar, a day on which the basic events of the salvation of mankind were jointly remembered[48] just as on January 6 were and still are remembered the basic events of the early life of Christ—this poem says that it is the day when:

tecait fainnli fria nglan dail	the swallows come on their pure meeting-place.

The third verse treats of April 15, but the second part of the second verse of September 24. This disruption of the calendaric sequence is not to be explained entirely by the natural facts referred to. The reference in the second part of the second verse seems to be to the departure of the swallows.[49] In Ireland, the swallows normally do not come until mid-April and do not leave until mid-October. The connection between the dates of March 25 and September 24 exceeds those natural facts: the former date is primarily *Compert Issu Crist* and the latter *Compert Iohain* (*Félire Oengusso*). In spite of its appearance, the poem *Enlaith betha* is basically a devotional *félire.*

---

[42] PL 121, 585 ff.

[43] A comparison of the adjectives used in this respect in the Latin, Irish and Anglo-Saxon texts would be of particular importance.

[44] Such illustrations, of course, later became a popular feature even in liturgical calendars, e.g., *Ms.* Bodl. *Add.* A 46 (30133) and in the *livres d'heures.*

[45] See *supra,* note 8.

[46] See *supra,* note 39.

[47] *Ms.* BMCSR prefaced to the *Martyrologium poeticum* a versified explanation of the Roman calendar, also referred to in Wandelbert's *Propositio* and Oengus' Prologue, 293 ff., especially 305 f. Compare also the poem 'to reckon feasts on the same week-day' in *Ms Rawl.* 512 of the *Félire Oengusso,* ed. Henry Bradshaw Society, p. 212. This is, incidentally, the only work in this field to which we could possibly apply the description of 'série mnémotechnique', cf. Wilmaert, *art. cit.,* 51 and 59. If this description were applied to the *Martyrologium poeticum,* as Bishop and Wilmaert suggested, the fact that this unofficial and local compilation was spread and developed for two centuries throughout Western Europe becomes quite inexplicable.

[48] See my article 'Liturgical Year and Financial Year', *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* V,70 (1948), 332-46.

As the transition from the *Martyrology of Tallaght* (which added to the foreign saints as listed in the *Martyrologium Hieronymianum,* in a separate section for each day, about the same number of Irish saints) to the *Félire Oengusso* (where commemorations of Irish and foreign saints are intermingled) shows, one of the functions of the *felire* was to co-ordinate the devotions to Irish and non-Irish saints.[50] In the poem *Enlaith betha,* the dates of three great feasts of the Church universal are followed by three feasts of Irish saints. The punctuation in Best-Lawlor's translation obscures the point that in the third verse *feil Ruadain* is identical with *sechtmad déc calaind mái* (feast of St. Ruadan 15/4). In the *Félire Oengusso,* Ródan Lothrai is the only saint commemorated on 15/4; in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* he is the second in the Irish section, perhaps an indication that the poem *Enlaith betha* drew on the former work. In the third verse of *Enlaith betha,* again, no reference is made to any devotional or other associations of the saint; the facts connected with his day are purely natural: "Their fetters (of the swallows or the birds in general?) are unloosed, . . . the cuckoo calls from the wood".

The fourth verse is concerned with the nones of July. Whatever may be the meaning of the third line which ends in the *Book of Leinster* with the words *conait chet bí,* and in the Brussels manuscripts with the words *nar rug bad bí,* there is again no obvious connection between the natural fact:

anait eoin	the birds cease
do chantain chiuil lith lathi	to sing the music of festive days

and the final words *do* (for) *Mail Ruain o Thamlacti.* In the light of the final verse of our poem (see below), it may be suggested that the singing of the birds is described as suitable music to honour the feasts of saints, and that this music is thoughtfully extended by the birds to the day of St. Maelruain of Tallaght. The words *lith lathi* are a reduplication; both the noun *laithe* ("day") and the noun *lith* (generally translated by "festival") are used by Oengus apparently as synonymous with *feil.* Of the *Conversio Pauli,* Oengus said that *ni delbul al-lathe, lith* ("not puny is the day—a festival"). In the *Félire Oengusso* none of those three nouns has the specific meaning of liturgical festival, not only because the old Irish church did not have Masses in honour of individual saints, but also because these words are associated with the names of too many saints who undoubtedly never enjoyed liturgical cultus. The choice made by the *féliri* (and indeed by martyrologies and calendars in general)[51] in commemorating Irish saints can be shown to be based on personal or local devotion (as was, of course, also the insertion of undoubtedly unliturgical saints in the *Martyrologium poeticum*). In the present instance, however, it would be hard to deduce that the author of *Enlaith betha* had special reason to refer to St. Maelruain.[52] The date of this well-known saint[53] corresponded remarkably well with the natural fact associated with it.

---

[49] I am indebted to Professor Gerard Murphy for his helpful criticism on this point.

[50] See my article, *Speculum* XXI, 47 ff.

[51] See *supra,* note 32.

[52] Still it might be suggested that the author of the poem *Enlaith betha* wrote somewhere within the triangle Lothra (Co. Tipperary), Clonmacnoise and Tallaght.

[53] Although Oengus referred to this saint as his *aite* (fosterer) in his *Epil.* 65, he did not devote his whole entry for July 7 to him, but only the second half. In the *Martyrology of Tallaght,* he is the second Irish saint for that day, but he is, of course, the latest Irish saint commemorated in the 'diptychs' of

Continuing in the calendaric order, the fifth verse of *Enlaith betha* refers to two days in September: *feil* Ciarain *meic in tsaer*[54] ("the feast of Kiaran, son of the wright") and *feil* Ciprian (note that this name is not declined). On the former day:

tecait giugraind dar fairge uair[55]	wild geese come over the cold sea

and on the latter:

gesid dam dond din rái réid[56]	the brown stag bells from the ruddy field.

The association between these two saints may be due to the alliteration of their names.

The sixth verse is a curious prediction of the part which the birds will play on Doomsday. Similarly the Epilogue of the *Félire Oengusso* is largely eschatological, perhaps an analogy to the liturgical year.

The final verse:

Atnagat combinni cheoil	Melodious music the birds perform
ind eoin fri rig nime nel	to the king of the heaven of clouds,
ic admolad ind rig reil	praising the radiant king.
coistid cleir na n-én do chéin	Hark from afar to the choir of the birds (Best-Lawlor)

invites comparison with the familiar words of the Preface: *Et ideo cum omni militia caelestis exercitus hymnum gloriae tuae canimus*, not to mention, of course, the legends of St. Francis. As in the references to the zodiacal signs (notably in *Ms Galba* A xviii, etc.), in this instance the double meaning of *nem* or *coelum* comes into play, the birds taking the place of the angels.

In all *félire* literature, the *Félire Adamnáin* has the shortest calendar. The calendar of *Enlaith betha* is only slightly more explicit. The *Menologium* has 26 feasts, the *Martyrologium poeticum* twice as many and this number was steadily increased in its later manuscripts down to Erchimpert, until in *Ms Galba* A xviii etc.,[57] we have strictly but one entry for every day, and in Wandelbert's *Martyrologium* several entries on many days. The *Félire Oengusso* also has one entry for every day and on most days several commemorations, and the *Félire húi Gormáin* still further tried to bring the *félire* to the completeness of prose martyrologies.[58] Only in Irish literature could works, so obviously different in size and scope, have been described by the same word, because only in the old Irish church did these works have a common definite function in devotional

---

the Stowe Mass. He is also among the Irish saints in the calendars in *Ms Galba* A xviii and *Tib.* B v but not in *Jul.* A vi, something that Bishop, see *supra*, note 29, did not know because Hampson did not indicate his replacement there by a non-Irish saint, namely Parmenius. Oengus devoted the first half of his entry for that same day to the latter (the Roman section for that day in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* is lost).

[54] Kiaran of Clonmacnoise was generally distinguished by this cognomen from his namesake, not only in the *Martyrology of Tallaght* and in the *Félire Oengusso*, but also in the Karlsruhe Bede calendar (see *supra*, note 32), but not, however, in Cuimmin's poem where the seventh quatrain refers to *Ciaran Cluana*.

[55] In regard to my remark in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* V,77 (1952), note 1, this persistent use of the word *uar* with reference to damp cold is remarkable.

[56] This beautiful verse invites, in a very particular way, comparison with the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium*.

[57] While there is a steady development from the original version of the *Martyrologium poeticum* to these latter works, the relationship between the Anglo-Saxon and Irish naturalistic calendars is remarkably free, just, however, as might be expected from the nature of these works.

[58] The incompleteness of the early Western martyrologies right up to Bede is due to lack of material for certain days rather than to deliberate selection for devotional purposes. Gorman, who was a Canon Regular of St. Augustine, misinterpreted the traditional *félire* as a liturgical work; his misinterpretation can be ascribed to Continental influence. This misconception was also introduced into the tradition of the *Martyrologium poeticum* by the postscript of *Ms S*:

life. The word *félire* is the only existing word to describe unambiguously what Stokes and Quentin called "metrical martyrologies": these works are not martyrologies in the traditional sense, and their metrical character is essential to their function.

The naturalist type of *félire* considered in this paper illustrates distinctively the conception of time underlying this form of devotion to the saints. Devotion to the saints in the cyclical order of natural time as contrasted with the linear order of historical times ("anniversaries") survives in the association of such devotion with certain months or week-days, a form of devotion which in many instances still has a wider popular appeal than the strictly liturgical devotions of the *Sanctorale*. The *Félire húi Gormáin* marked the submergence of the Irish tradition of *félire* in the tradition of liturgical calendars. The poem *Enlaith betha* marks its submergence in the tradition of secular nature-calendars[59] (which, of course, goes back as far as Hesiodus). Can we fail to recognise the similarity between lines 5 and 6 of *Enlaith betha* (for 25/3) and the following lines from Chaucer's *Parliament of Fowles*:

> For this was on seynt Valentyne's day
> When every foul cometh ther to choose his mate?

Could we not find something of the spirit of *Enlaith betha* v. 3 in the opening lines of Goethe's *Reineke Fuchs*:

> Pfingsten, das liebliche Fest, war gekommen; es grünten und blühten
> Feld und Wald; auf Hügeln und Höhn, in Büschen und Hecken
> Uebten ein fröhliches Lied die neuermunterten Vögel?

Even in non-Catholic countries, in secular "peasant calendars" the names of saints' days have survived, and Irish folklore to this day offers examples of purely external associations of rules regarding nature with certain feast-days.[60] The last verse of *Enlaith betha*, however, makes it clear that this poem still maintained the devotional tradition of the *félire* against what appeared to be an irresistible tide of naturalism.

SUMMARY:

(1) This is the first study made of the poem *Enlaith betha*.
(2) For the first time *Félire Adamnáin* and the poem *Enlaith betha* are studied within the tradition of the *félire*.
(3) This tradition is considered the backbone of the European tradition of "metrical martyrologies", of which the Anglo-Saxon *Menologium* and its Irish counterparts, as well as certain strata in the "calendar" in *Ms Galba* A xviii and parallels, represent the naturalistic trend which survived in secular calendars.

Hos quicumque versus legerit lector, hoc minus et martirologium quod et sequens adesse videtur, praecipuas anni festivitates absque ulla titubationis errore scire volebit. The main difference between Wandelbert's work and that of Oengus is that the former gave the idea of *félire* a liturgical form.

[59] See, e.g., the calendar (*ca.* 1370) in *Ms. Rawl.* D. 39 (Bodeleian Library, *Liturgical Manuscripts*, p. 47 f.)

Textes sur Saint Bernard et Gilbert de la Porrée

J. LECLERCQ O.S.B.

DANS la mêlée des doctrines et des tendances qui rendent si vivante l'histoire du XIIe siècle, Gilbert de la Porrée eut pour principal adversaire saint Bernard de Clairvaux. Aussi ne peut-on rechercher les textes relatifs au second sans en trouver qui se rapportent au premier. Quelques-uns d'entre eux seront présentés ici. Ils s'ajoutent, bien que leurs données restent très fragmentaires, au dossier assez pauvre des documents qui nous renseignent sur le concile de Reims de 1148, à la suite duquel fut attaquée la doctrine de Gilbert, alors évêque de Poitiers.[1] Ils permettent aussi d'entrevoir la survie de cette doctrine et l'influence posthume du maître qui l'avait enseignée avec tant de sincérité. Quand, vers 1185, certains de ses admirateurs entreprirent de venger sa mémoire, on fut amené à faire, d'une certaine façon, le procès de son antagoniste. Avec le recul du temps, on apprécia mieux la valeur propre à chacun de ces deux grands esprits: c'est par là que ces témoignages enrichissent l'histoire.

I. AUTOUR DE 1148.

Il est peu de sources contemporaines qui nous informent sur le concile de Reims, et elles émanent de l'un ou l'autre des partis en présence: les récits d'Otton de Freising[1] et de Jean de Salisbury[2] sont favorables à Gilbert, et celui de Geoffroy d'Auxerre[3] l'est à Bernard. Et ce sont là des sources rédigées: les données de fait qu'a retenues chaque auteur s'y trouvent glosées par un commentaire qui, plus ou moins, les interprète dans un sens ou dans l'autre.[4]

Voici un document plus sobre: il est constitué par une simple série de textes et de notes. Un copiste que Dom Wilmart situe en France septentrionale[5] l'a ajouté, au XII^e siècle, à la série des lettres de Fulbert de Chartres et d'Hildebert du Mans, dans un manuscrit qui appartint à Petau et passa dans le fonds Reginensis du Vatican (*Reg. lat.* 278, fols. 72-3). Dans sa brièveté, ce texte a l'intérêt de nous montrer, pour ainsi dire à l'état brut, sans commentaires, le matériel de citations qui servit d'argument patristique dans la discussion; ces citations, qui se retrouvent en grande partie dans Geoffroy d'Auxerre, ont dû être empruntées à quelque recueil de sentences. En outre, le texte nous livre les noms de ceux qui prirent part à la discussion: les autres sources ont moins de précision. Aux archevêques et aux évêques sont associés ici des abbés et des écolâtres. Nous apprenons qu'à côté de Pierre le Vénérable, abbé de Cluny, de saint Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux, de Suger, abbé de Saint-Denis, se trouvait le Bx Otton, abbé prémontré de Kapenberg, au diocèse de Munster. Les écolâtres mentionnés paraissent tous appartenir au groupe des adversaires du Porrétain. On voit parmi eux ceux qui sont connus par d'autres sources et que les historiens citent à l'envie: Gauthier de Mortagne, Arnauld de Poitiers—désigné simplement comme "l'archidiacre"—Pierre Lombard, Thierry de Chartres, Adam de Petitpont; mais quelques noms nouveaux s'ajoutent ici.

---

[1] L'usage est de l'appeler Gilbert de la Porrée; Geoffroy d'Auxerre le désignait comme *Porretanus* (*Epist. de condemn. errorum Gilb. Porret.*, 1; PL 185, 587). Mais la forme originale de son nom était *Gilbertus Porreta*, ainsi que l'a montré F. Pelster, 'Gilbert de la Porrée, Gilbertus Porretanus oder Gilbertus Porreta?', *Scholastik* XX, (1949), 401-3.

[1] *Gesta Friderici imperatoris* I, 52-61; éd. G. Waitz, MGH, *Script. rer german. in us. schol.* (1912), pp. 74-88.

[2] *Historia pontificalis*, 11; ed. R. L. Poole (Oxford, 1927), pp. 27-9.

[3] *Epistola de condemnatione errorum Gilberti Porretani;* PL 185, 587-96, et *Libellus contra capitula Gilberti Pictauiensis episcopi;* ibid., 595-618.

[4] Une excellente mise au point est donnée par A. Hayen, 'Le concile de Reims et l'erreur théologique de Gilbert de la Porrée', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, X-XI (1936), 29-102. On consulte toujours utilement le solide et équitable Vacandard, *Vie de saint Bernard* II (Paris, 1895), pp. 327-43. L'essentiel de la bibliographie jusqu'en 1946 est donné par A. Forest, 'Le mouvement doctrinal du XI^e au XIV^e siècle', *Histoire de l'Eglise* de A. Fliche et V. Martin XIII (Paris, 1951), p. 81.

[5] *Codices Reginenses latini* I (Cité du Vatican, 1937), p. 85.

A la fin de sa lettre sur Gilbert de la Porrée, Geoffroy d'Auxerre dit avoir retrouvé un autre écrit qu'il avait composé près de quarante ans auparavant et dont il parle en ces termes:

> . . . Scriptura alia diu quaesita, iam penitus mihi desperanti exhibita est, quam super eisdem capitulis ante annos pene quadraginta edideram cum ipso symbolo, quod domino Papae et Romanae ecclesiae, ex parte decem archiepiscoporum et omnium episcoporum pene, qui in illa adhuc die Remis inuenti sunt cum abbatibus maximis atque plurimis, et magistris scholarum, et subscriptis nominibus singulorum, per superius memoratas personas fuerat praesentatum.[6]

L'écrit dont parle ici Geoffroy est son *Libellus* bien connu. Or le texte du *Reginensis* 278 donne les *capitula*, le symbole, les noms des archevêques, des évêques, des abbés et des *magistri scholarum* qui se trouvaient encore à Reims, après le concile, quand fut discutée la doctrine de Gilbert: il semble que ce texte soit celui que, dans son *Libellus*, Geoffroy commente, mais sans en reproduire tous les noms de personnes. On aurait là, pour ainsi dire, les "actes" de cette suite au concile de Reims:

> ERROR GILLEBERTI PICTAVIENSIS EPISCOPI. CAP(UT) I. Quod diuina natura, quae diuinitas dicitur, Deus non sit, sed forma qua Deus est, sicut humanitas homo non est sed forma qua homo est.[7]—Contra: Augustinus: "Omnis natura aut Deus est aut a Deo".[8] [I]n libro *De Trinitate*: "Deus non ea magnitudine magnus est quae non est quod ipse; alioquin illa erit maior magnitudo quam Deus".[9]
>
> CAP. II. Quod cum Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus unum esse dicuntur, non nisi una diuinitate esse intelligantur, nec conuerti possit unus Deus uel una substantia uel unum aliquid Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus esse dicatur.—Contra: Theodericus, Gregorius: "Ibi enim unitas uere est trinitas et trinitas uere est unitas".[10] Augustinus *De fide ad Petrum*: "Quia in illo uno uero Deo trinitate non solum quod unus Deus est, sed etiam quod trinitas est naturaliter uerum est, propterea ipse Deus uerus in personis trinitas est, in una natura unus est".[11] Athanasius *Contra Arium et Sabellium*: "Illuc mihi necessario uidero festinandum ut tres unum esse et unum tres esse, etsi non ratione qua homo sum, tamen auctoritate perdoceam".[12] Theodericus: "Existentis scientia est Deus, Deus est trinitas".[13] Augustinus *De Trinitate*: "Consequenter intelligitur non tantum de Patre dixisse

---

[6] *Epist. de condemn. errorum Gilb. Porret.*, 13; PL 185, 595.

[7] Le texte de cette proposition, et des suivantes, concorde presque entièrement avec celui qui en est donné, d'après une copie de Sirmond, dans Mansi, *Concilia* XXI, cols. 711-2, et diffère de celui qu'en donne Geoffroy d'Auxerre; PL 185, 617.

[8] S. Augustin, *Contra Iulianum* I, viii, 36; PL 44, 666: ita ut omnino nulla natura sit quae non aut ipse sit, aut ab ipso facta sit.

[9] Résume Boèce, *De Trinitate*, 4; PL 64, 1252. La même sentence, quelque peu développée, mais également attribuée à s. Augustin, est citée par Geoffroy d'Auxerre, *Libellus*, 14; PL 185, 599, et *Epistola*, 5; *ibid.*, 590.

[10] Théodoret, *De Trintate;* PG 83, 1171. Une autre sentence du même ouvrage traduit de Théodoret est citée par Othon de Freising, *Gesta* I, 58; *éd. cit.*, p. 84; d'après l'apparat de variantes donné, *ibid.*, plusieurs manuscrits des *Gesta* portent également *Theodoricus* ou *Theodericus*.

[11] S. Fulgence, *De Fide ad Petrum* I, 4; PL 40, 754; également cité sous le nom de s. Augustin, par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 35; PL 185, 607.

[12] Paroles d'Athanase dans le *Contra arianos dialogus* II, 42, de Vigile de Thapse; PL 62, 225; cité par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 38; PL 185, 608.

[13] Théodoret, *De Trinitate;* PG 83, 1167.

Apostolum: Qui solus habet immortalitatem, sed de uno solo Deo qui est Trinitas".[14] Idem: "Supernarum uirtutum carmina unum tres esse et tres unum esse demonstrant".[15] Idem: "Nec Sabellium incurrimus tres Deum fatendo, nec tuae perfidiae laqueis retinemur dum hunc Deum in trinitate esse ingenue confitemur".[16]

Cap. III. Quod tres personae tribus unitatibus sint tria et distinctae tribus proprietatibus quae non sunt ipse personae, sed tres aeternae et ab inuicem et a diuina substantia numero differentes.—Contra: Augustinus, *De essentia diuinitatis*: "Deus simplex est natura et immutabilis et imperturbata nec aliud est ipse et aliud quod habet".[17] Idem habes in Ieronimo, *De essentia Dei.*[18] Idem in Ysidoro,[19] Beda. [Boetius], *De Trinitate*: "Hoc uere est: unum in quo nullus est numerus quia nullum in eo aliud praeter id quod est".[20] Ieronimus ad Damasum papam: "Non enim nomina tantummodo, sed etiam nominum proprietates id est personas uel, ut graeci exprimunt, ypostases, hoc est substantias, confitemur".[21]

Cap. IIII. Quod diuina natura non sit incarnata.—Contra: Leo papa: "Assumpta est a maiestate humilitas, a uirtute infirmitas, ab aeternitate mortalitas, et natura inuiolabilis naturae est unita passibili".[22] Idem: "Carnem sibi inuiolabilis Verbi deitas coaptauit".[23] Gregorius: "Venit ad nos calciata diuinitas".[24]

Credimus simplicem naturam diuinitatis esse Deum . . .—. . . incarnatam esse sed in Filio.[25]

Nomina archiepiscoporum qui interfuerunt concilio. Remensis. Bituricensis. Burdegalensis. Turonensis. Treuerensis. Cesariensis. Eboracensis. Cantuariensis. Rotomagensis. Viennensis. Episcoporum. Suessionensis. Cathalaunensis. Parisiensis. Autisiodorensis. Ambianensis. Tornacensis. Morinensis. Noruincensis. Valentinus. Cenomannensis. Aletensis. Engolismensis. Xantonensis.—Abbatum. Cluniacensis. Cisterciensis. Clareuallensis. Sancti Dionisii. Sancti Benedicti. Corbinensis. Premostratensis. Otto Capemburgensis et alii plures.—Magistri scolarum. Gauterius de Maurit[ania]. Gauterius eboracensis. Archid[iaconus]. Gaufridus eboracensis archidiaconus. Humbertus bituric[ensis]. Petrus lumb[ardus]. Theodericus carnot[ensis]. Robertus de bosco. Adam de paruo ponte et alii multi.

Dans ce texte l'abbé de Clairvaux figurait à son rang, comme un nom parmi d'autres. Il est pourtant des manuscrits où le procès de Gilbert au concile est présenté comme un combat singulier entre Bernard et lui. Dans un manuscrit provenant de l'abbaye cistercienne de Vauclair, au diocèse de Laon, parmi des sentences patristiques sur Dieu et la prédestination, chacune des propositions

---

[14] *De Trinitate* I, vi, 10; PL 42, 826; cité par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 32; PL 185, 606.

[15] Paroles d'Athanase dans le *Contra Arianos* II, 42, de Vigile de Thapse; PL 62, 225; cité dans Geoffroy, *Epistola* 6; PL 185, 590, et *Libellus*, 36; *ibid.*, 608.

[16] Paroles d'Athanase dans le *Contra Arianos* II, 46, de Vigile de Thapse; PL 62, 227; cité dans Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 38; PL 185, 608.

[17] Ps. Augustin, *De Essentia diuinitatis*, 1; PL 42, 1200; cité par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 48; PL 185, 613.

[18] Le même texte que le précédent, légèrement abrégé. est cité par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 50; PL 185, 613, sous le nom de Jérôme.

[19] Un texte d'Isidore dans le même sens, *Etym.* VII, i, 26; PL 82, 262, est cité, avant le précédent, par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 49; PL 185, 613.

[20] Boèce, *De Trinitate* II; PL 64, 1250; cité par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 43; PL 185, 610. Dans le manuscrit, l'espace où devrait être écrit le nom de Boèce est laissé en blanc.

[21] Semble résumer Jérôme, *Epist.* XVI, 4; PL 22, 357: cité sous cette forme par Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 50; PL 185, 613, et par Guillaume de Saint-Thierry, *De Erroribus Guillelmi de Conchis;* PL 180, 336.

[22] Cite, en l'abrégeant, s. Léon, *Sermo XXI*, 2; PL 54, 192, également cité dans Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 61; PL 185, 615.

[22] S. Léon, *Sermo XXV*, 2; PL 54, 209.

[24] S. Grégoire le Grand, *Hom. in Eu.* VII, 3; PL 76, 1101D; cité sous la même forme, légèrement différente du texte de Grégoire lui-même, dans Geoffroy, *Libellus*, 57; PL 185, 615; cité sous une autre forme encore dans Geoffroy, *Epistola*, 7; *ibid.*, 591.

[25] Mansi, *Concilia* XXI, cols. 712-3.

reprochées à Gilbert est suivie de l'article correspondant de la profession de foi qui s'y oppose; ces articles sont mis sous le nom de Bernard, comme si le dialogue s'était échangé entre ces deux adversaires seulement:

> Gilbertus Porretanus. Quod diuina natura id est diuinitas . . .
> Ber[nardus] abbas. Credimus simplicem naturam . . .
> G[ilbertus] Por[retanus]. Quod non unus Deus . . .
> B[ernardus] abbas. Cum de tribus personis loquimur . . .
> G[ilbertus] Por[retanus]. Quod proprietates personarum . . .
> B[ernardus] abbas. Credimus solum Deum . . .
> G[ilbertus] Por[retanus]. Quod diuina natura non sit incarnata . . .
> B[ernardus] abbas. Credimus ipsam . . .—. . . sed in filio.[26]

Dans un manuscrit de ce monastère d'Anchin dont l'abbé Alvise fut en relations avec saint Bernard,[27] la profession de foi est également attribuée à l'abbé de Clairvaux:

> Eodem anno heresim concitat magister Gislebertus asserens:
> Quod diuina natura id est diuinitas . . .
> Quod non unus Deus . . .
> Quod proprietates personarum . . .
> Quod diuina natura non sit incarnata . . .
> Responsio domni Bernardi abbatis Clare Vallis. Credimus simplicem naturam . . .—. . . sed in filio.[28]

Enfin, dans un exemplaire du *De Consideratione* de saint Bernard qui fut copié à Clairvaux peu d'années après la mort de l'auteur, une main contemporaine, dans une marge, a écrit ces mots: *Contra errorem Gisleberti;* or cette note se trouve en face d'un passage du livre V, composé en 1152 ou 1153, où il est question de la nature de Dieu: *Quid est Deus? Quo nihil melius cogitari potest. Si approbas, non oportet assentiaris esse aliquid quo Deus sit et quod Deus non sit . . .*[29]

Lisait-on, à Clairvaux, les oeuvres de Gilbert? Il subsiste un exemplaire de son commentaire de Boèce parmi les manuscrits de Clairvaux: il est du XII^e^ siècle, et il n'est pas exclu qu'il ait servi à saint Bernard.[30] Un autre manuscrit de Clairvaux, également du XII^e^ siècle, commence par un traité anonyme *De dilectione.*[31] Ce thème était cher aux écrivains spirituels cisterciens, influencés par saint Bernard. Or certaines formules de ce traité rappellent celles d'Abélard et de Gilbert de la Porrée. Seulement, ici elles n'alimentent plus la polémique, mais la mystique:

> Cum uero haec sit sanctae Trinitatis distinctio: Pater est potentia, Filius est sapientia, Spiritus Sanctus benignitas, non solum, ut ait quidam,[32] ad summi boni perfectionem describendam, uerum etiam plurimum prodere ad diuini cultus religionem hominibus persuadendam. Duo siquidem sunt quae nos maxime Deo subiectos efficiunt: timor uidelicet et amor. Potentia quippe

---

[26] *Ms* Laon 176, XII^{e} s., fol. 45-45^{v}.

[27] Cf. Vacandard, *op. cit.*, I, p. 138 et *passim.*

[28] *Ms* Douai 365, XII^{e} s., fol. 2-2^{v}. Le texte suit celui de la lettre d'Arnould sur la prise de Lisbonne le 25 Octobre, 1147: éd. Martene, *Ampl. coll.* I (Paris, 1724), p. 800. Dans un autre manuscrit d'Anchin, Douai 372, qui est la premiére collection ancienne d'oeuvres et de *Vies* de s. Bernard, se trouve ajoutée (t. II, fol. 1-1^{v}) la lettre de Gauthier de Mortagne, l'un des adversaires de Gilbert de la Porrée, sur la science de l'âme du Christ; PL 186, 1052; ce manuscrit s'ajoutera à ceux qu'a énumérés L. Ott, *Untersuchungen zur theologischen Briefliteratur der Frühscholastik* (Münster en W., 1937), p. 341, n. 3.

[29] *Ms* Troyes 426, fol. 148^{v}; cf. *De Consid.* V, vii, 15; PL 182, 797.

[30] *Ms* Troyes 1841.

[31] *Ms* Troyes 1621, XII^{e} s., fols. 1-22, inc.: Frater fratri, de dilectione. Petitioni uestrae, frater carissime, satisfacere pusillanimitas nostra . . . Le début est peu original; jusqu'au fol. 12, le texte est surtout constitué de citations bibliques et patristiques.

[32] Les mots *ut ait quidam* sont une addition interlinéaire contemporaine.

> et sapientia timorem incutiunt . . . Benignitas autem specialiter ad amorem pertinet . . .[33]

Mais ces textes où les formules d'Abélard et de Gilbert servaient de point de départ à des développements sur la charité semblent avoir été rares. Dans les milieux monastiques, cisterciens et bénédictins, on continuait à voir un danger pour la foi dans ces essais de théologie spéculative. Témoin ce traité où un moine de Saint-Jacques de Liège, Guillaume, demande qu'on institue une fête de la Trinité pour affirmer ce dogme en réaction contre les erreurs qui, à son avis, continuent de le menacer.[34]

Dans l'entourage de Gilbert, au contraire, on continuait à lui faire gloire de son enseignement. A sa mort, en 1154, le doyen de Poitiers Laurent, qui devait lui succéder bientôt comme évêque de cette ville, prononça son éloge. Le texte a été édité par D. Brial,[35] sauf quelques passages qui ne sont que de la littérature et n'apportent rien à l'histoire.[36] L'un d'eux, cependant, mérite d'être publié ici, car il nous montre qu'en Gilbert on estimait non seulement l'évêque, mais le maître en théologie:

> Ille audiens Apostolum suum dicentem: *Gratia Dei sum id quod sum et gratia eius in me uacua non fuit,*[37] ne forte in uacuum gratiam Dei recepisset,[38] collatam sibi diuini muneris gratiam cunctis communicabilem faciens, noluit eam propriis usibus reseruare. Unde meruit eminere magisterii merito supra omnes doctores in tempore suo et obtinuit nomen grande super nomen magnorum qui sunt in terra . . .[39]

II. AUTOUR DE 1185.

Après le concile de Reims, pendant plusieurs générations, saint Bernard et Gilbert continuaient de s'opposer dans l'esprit de leurs admirateurs respectifs. Le porrétanisme gardait des adeptes fervents.[1] Mais surtout Bernard et Gilbert symbolisaient deux attitudes intellectuelles qui n'avaient pas cessé de se distinguer au cours de tout le moyen âge et qui, devenues davantage conscientes, risquaient parfois de se trouver en conflit. Un témoin lucide—et charmant—de cet antagonisme aide à saisir à quel point il était profond et mérite, à ce titre, d'être présenté.

Le manuscrit 259 de la Bibliothèque municipale de Cambrai vient de la cathédrale de cette ville. C'est un volumineux recueil de plus de 600 pages de format restreint (208 x 152 mm). D'une écriture extrèmement fine du XIII^{e} siècle y sont copiés des textes d'auteurs variés, mais qui tous sont du XII^{e} siècle ou de la fin du XI^{e}: saint Anselme, Yves de Chartres, Rupert de Deutz, Hugues de Fouilloy, Honorius Augustodunensis, Hildebert du Mans, Raoul de Flay, Hugues et Richard de Saint-Victor. A ce recueil assez peu homogène, mais caractéristique de diverses écoles, se trouvent mêlés trois textes qui constituent un ensemble. On a d'abord (fol. 228-228^{v}) une lettre adressée au pape Urbain

---

[33] Fol. 12.

[34] J'ai présenté ce texte sous le titre: 'Le traité de Guillaume de Saint-Jacques sur la Trinité', *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge,* XVIII (1950-51), 89-102.

[35] *Recueil des historiens de la France et des Gaules* XIV (Paris, 1877), pp. 379-81. Le texte avait déjà été publié par J. Besly, *Evesques de Poictiers avec les preuves* (1637), pp. 103-8, d'après le *Ms Regin. lat.* 150 (XII^{e} s., Saint Michel en l'Herm, au diocèse de Luçon), fols. 156^{v}-9.

[36] Il manque dans l'édition de D. Brial, p. 379, neuf lignes du fol. 156^{v} du manuscrit *Reg. lat.* 150 et quatre lignes du fol. 157; p. 380, neuf lignes du fol. 157^{v} et sept lignes des fols. 158^{v}-9.

[37] *I Cor.* xv, 10.

[38] Cf. *II Cor.* vi, 1.

[39] *Ms Reg. lat.* 150, fol. 157^{v}.

[1] Cf. A. Hayen, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-7; A. Forest, *op. cit.*, pp. 163-4. F. Pelster, 'Die anonyme Verteidigungschrift der Lehre Gilberts von Poitiers im Cod. Vat. 561 und ihr Verfasser Canonicus Adhemar von Saint-Rufin Valence (um 1180)', *Studia medievalia in honorem R. J. Martin* (Bruges, s.d.), 113-46.

III par un certain Evrard dénonçant des erreurs qui s'enseignent à Paris au sujet de la Trinité et du Christ; il demande au pape d'informer sur ces erreurs et d'y mettre fin par une définition dogmatique. Puis, après un court extrait de Boèce (fol. 229^{r}), commence un long dialogue entre le moine Evrard et un certain Ratius. Il est question des moines et surtout de leurs préventions contre toute subtilité dans le domaine intellectuel. Mais bientôt sont nommés les deux représentants des tendances qui s'affrontent ici: saint Bernard et maître Gilbert. Ratius fait l'éloge du Porrétain, puis défend sa doctrine; Evrard pose des questions, parfois des objections: la discussion, serrée, se développe suivant un plan assez rigoureux, que plusieurs intermèdes viennent agrémenter: un prélat survient, qui donne l'occasion d'une invective contre le faste et la gourmandise de ses semblables; un neveu de Ratius, Sosie, prend part à la conversation. A l'arrivée et au départ de chacun de ces interlocuteurs—spécialement au moment des repas—des propos sur l'hospitalité ou d'autres sujets font diversion. Mais l'entretien progresse: Evrard, à son tour, fait l'éloge de saint Bernard; la compétence de ce dernier en morale "pratique" est précisée par opposition à celle du Porrétain dans le domaine de la théologie spéculative. Sosie met en parallèle la vie des clercs dans les écoles et celle des moines: ce sont ces deux milieux qui, en réalité, affirment en cette controverse leurs aspirations.

Enfin (fols. 240^{v}-241^{v}) une lettre à Evrard complète le dossier. Un correspondant dont le nom commence par un B—l'initiale est seule donnée—parle à Evrard de sa lettre à Urbain III et du dialogue qui précède et lui propose d'y apporter quelques corrections en faisant appel, s'il le faut, aux lumières de Ratius.

Ces trois textes constituent donc un ensemble homogène: Evrard est donné comme l'auteur des deux premiers et le destinataire du troisième; Ratius est nommé dans les deux derniers; le style est le même dans les trois. Mais surtout, dans les trois est abordé le même problème: l'opposition entre Bernard et Gilbert—et entre les milieux monastique et scolaire. La date à laquelle sont rapportés ces trois textes est indiquée dès le début, semble-t-il, avec assez de précision, puisque Urbain III fut pape de novembre 1185 à octobre 1187. Dans la lettre qui lui est adressée, Evrard fait allusion à une intervention doctrinale du "pape Alexandre": il s'agit du prédécesseur d'Urbain III, Alexandre III (1159-1181).[2] Saint Bernard est donné comme déjà canonisé, ce qui avait eu lieu en 1174. Pourtant, vers le début du dialogue, Evrard dit avoir été, "en France, clerc du seigneur Hyacinthe, actuellement pape": cette mention ne peut s'appliquer qu'à Hyacinthe Orsini, qui fut pape de 1191 à 1198 sous le nom de Célestin III; il semble bien qu'il ait séjourné à Paris pour ses études, et il était au concile de Sens de 1140 ou 1141, où il prit la défense d'Abélard.[3] Il faudrait donc admettre que la lettre destinée à Urbain III ne lui ait pas été expédiée, ou qu'il subsiste une certaine incohérence entre les données chronologiques des trois textes.

Il n'est pas plus facile, en effet, d'en identifier l'auteur que d'en situer la date. Le nom d'Evrard est clairement indiqué dès le début des deux premiers. Mais quel est ce personnage? Il donne à saint Bernard le titre de "pater noster", comme le faisaient volontiers les cisterciens; toutes les circonstances auxquelles il fait allusion donnent à penser que le dialogue avec Ratius a eu lieu dans un monastère cistercien. Mais où situer celui-ci? Evrard écrit au pape qu'il s'adresse à lui "depuis les extrémités de la terre". Est-ce à dire qu'il vit loin de Rome, aux frontières occidentales de l'Europe,[4] ou n'y a-t-il là qu'une simple réminiscence du *Ps.* LX? Il dit s'être entretenu avec l'*abbas Monasteriensis*: il peut s'agir d'une des abbayes des régions germaniques dont le nom fut Münster, mais dont aucune ne fut cistercienne, ou—ce qui est plus vraisemblable—de l'abbaye cistercienne de Montier-en-Argonne.[5] Evrard n'est pas désigné comme abbé, mais ne fallait-il pas qu'il fût revêtu de quelque dignité pour qu'il osât écrire au pape? On le voit, toutes ces données restent bien imprécises.

---

[2] Condamnation de la proposition: Christus non est aliquid secundum quod homo, par la lettre *Cum Christus* du 18 février, 1177; Mansi, *Concilia* XXI, col. 1081.

[3] Cf. R. Mols, art. *Célestin III*, dans *Diction. d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés.* XII (Paris, 1950), col. 62.

[4] Geoffroy d'Auxerre, par exemple, écrit

Le nom d'Evrard est assez répandu, au moyen âge, en Flandre et aux environs.[6] Parmi les écrivains du XII^e siècle ou du commencement du XIII^e qui se soient appelés Evrard, il en est trois en qui, à priori, on semble avoir des chances de reconnaître l'auteur des textes de Cambrai. On pense d'abord à Evrard de Béthune; mais celui-ci est avant tout un logicien et un grammairien; son *Grecismus* est plein de citations de Platon et surtout d'Aristote:[7] le style et le genre de ce traité sont déjà ceux de la scolastique du XIII^e siècle et ils diffèrent absolument des textes de Cambrai. Evrard de Béthune a d'ailleurs écrit vers 1212, longtemps après Urbain III et Célestin III. Un autre Evrard de Béthune est l'auteur d'un ouvrage contre les Vaudois dont le titre est *Antihaeresis*: Jacques Gretser, qui l'a édité, le donne comme cistercien et se demande s'il est le même que l'auteur du *Grecismus*.[8] On a voulu le rattacher au "porrétanisme philosophique":[9] mais il fait seulement profession d'antinominalisme,[10] et son traité paraît également plus tardif que les textes du manuscrit de Cambrai. On pense alors au Bx Evrard, abbé cistercien de Clairmarais, au diocèse de Thérouanne,[11] qui résigna sa charge en 1187. Une chronique de Clairmarais dit que c'était un lettré, et qu'il reçut des bulles et des privilèges d'Urbain III au cours de plusieurs procès qui se terminèrent en sa faveur; après sa démission, il composa des livres et spécialement un traité sur l'accent;[12] il aurait également écrit des lettres rédigées selon l'art du *dictamen*.[13] Les dates où il vécut et ses préoccupations d'humaniste coïncideraient avec ce que nous révèlent d'Evrard les textes de Cambrai. Mais il n'y a là que des indices bien faibles, et sur lesquels ne peut s'appuyer qu'une conjecture.

Ratius,[14] le principal contradicteur d'Evrard, se présente, dès le début, comme originaire d'Athènes; plus loin il fait allusion à la bibliothèque qu'il possède à Athènes. Sur le conseil de sa soeur appelée Sophie, sa mère, dont le nom est *Ratio Atheniensis*, l'a envoyé en France: il y a été l'élève de Gilbert de la

---

à propos du voyage que l'évêque Eskil de Lund fit à Clairvaux pour y rencontrer s. Bernard: Quem *a finibus terrae* non curiositas audiendae sapientiae, sed fidei zelus plenitudo atraxerat. *Vita I Bernardi* IV, 25; PL 185, 335. De s. Malachie O'Morgair qui, d'Irlande, vint mourir à Clairvaux, s. Bernard dit qu'il vint a *finibus terrae*. *Serm. de Malachia* I, 2; PL 183, 483.

[5] Cf. L. Janauschek, *Origines cistercienses* (Vienne, 1877), p. 79.

[6] Le manuscrit porte indifféremment *Euerardus* ou *Eurardus*. L'orthographe *Eberhardus* est plus fréquente en Bavière et aux environs.

[7] Le *Grecismus* est fréquent dans les manuscrits, et il a été plusieurs fois édité. J'ai utilisé *Ms* Arras 880 (XIV^e s., Saint-Vaast d'Arras).

[8] L'éd. Gretser a été reproduite par Margarin de la Bigne, *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum* XXIV (Lyon, 1677), pp. 1520-84. Gretser l'a dédiée à l'abbé cistercien de Salem. Au sujet de l'identité de l'auteur du *Grecismus* et de celui de *l'Antihaeresis*, il écrit simplement: Certe nomen et patria concordant, p. 1522. De fait, dès le début, p. 1525, l'auteur se présente en ces termes: Ego Ebrardus, natione Flandrensis, Betunia oriundus . . .

[9] F. Vernet, art. *Gilbert de la Porrée*, dans *Diction. de théol. cathol.* VI (Paris, 1920), col. 1355.

[10] S'opposant au dualisme des vaudois, Ebrard explique que la Loi, bien qu'elle différât de l'Evangile, ne contenait pas un autre enseignement: Lex enim in euangelium translata alia quidem est, non aliud. Zacharias enim mutus fuit non aliud a se loquente . . . Eodem penitus modo lex ab euangelio differt. Euangelium enim nihil aliud quam apertio legis, quae erat obscura. Ne simus nominales in hoc, sed potius porretani . . .

[11] Aujourd'hui au diocèse d'Arras.

[12] Pacis et solitudinis amatorem et in litteris ualde gnarum . . . Reliquum uitae suae, cum ingenio excellenti polleret, consumpsit in componendis libris ex quibus unum, cui titulus *De Accentibus*, memorat Carolus de Visch, Dunensium prior, in suo Catalogo priorum ordinis, t. II, p. 103. *Historia domestica Claromarisci*, *Ms* Saint-Omer 850 (XVIII^e s.), fol. 229. Cf. aussi H. de Laplane, *Les Abbés de Clairmarais* (Saint-Omer, 1868), pp. 97-102; C. de Visch, *Biblioth. Cisterc.* II (1656), p. 103.

[13] D'après Daunou dans *l'Hist. litt. de la France* XV, p. 139.

[14] Le manuscrit porte généralement *Ratius*, parfois *Rascius*.

Porrée à Chartres et a ensuite accompagné son maître à Poitiers: il lui enseignait le grec tandis que Gilbert lui donnait des leçons de latin; après la mort de Gilbert, il composa son épitaphe.[15] Mais toutes ces allégations semblent très fantaisistes. Quant à Sosie, qui remplace un moment Ratius, son nom et son rôle sont bien artificiels, et on ne peut même pas émettre une hypothèse à son sujet. On ne peut se défendre de l'impression qu'on se trouve en présence d'une fiction littéraire: la lettre au pape est peut-être fictive et les personnages nommés ne sont sans doute pas historiques—ce qui ne veut pas dire qu'ils n'ont pas existé. Car ils sont les symboles de milieux réels: Ratius représente la raison grecque dont il porte le nom; c'est l'humanisme scolastique et intellectuel. Evrard, c'est l'humanisme monastique et le témoin d'une tendance mystique. Ratius parle, pour ainsi dire, au nom de la spéculation, Evrard au nom de la contemplation.[16]

Tour à tour les partenaires de ce petit drame, fort joliment écrit, émaillé de réminiscences classiques, font discrètement l'éloge, puis le procès du monde monastique et du monde scolaire: chacun de ces deux milieux, malgré ses faiblesses et ses dangers, offre des avantages et possède des qualités. Les prélats seuls n'ont rien qui vaille d'être loué: les interlocuteurs s'accordent sur ce point, ce qui achève de faire de ce texte une sorte de satire de la société cléricale dans la seconde moitié du XII^{e} siècle. Et pourtant sous ce badinage se dissimule un conflit très profond, où sont engagées des aspirations spirituelles divergentes, mais légitimes. On reproche à Bernard de n'avoir pas compris Gilbert de la Porrée;[17] mais on lui reconnaît une haute sainteté, on admire son enseignement moral et sa mystique. Il faut choisir entre l'occupation de Marthe et celle de Marie, entre la science et cette "sagesse" dont la définition selon Bernard sera donnée deux fois. Ou le cloître, ou Paris: tel est le vrai dilemme. En discutant de Bernard et de Gilbert, ce sont deux institutions, deux états de vie dans l'Eglise, deux conceptions du rôle de l'intelligence dans la vie chrétienne, que mettent en question les personnages du dialogue.

Les textes du manuscrit de Cambrai sont fort longs; ils occuperaient une centaine de pages d'édition, non sans apporter, semble-t-il, quelques lumières à l'histoire doctrinale. Il ne s'agit ici que de faire connaître ces nouveaux témoins, très explicites, des remous que, quarante ans après le concile de Reims, continuait de susciter la doctrine du Porrétain, malgré les censures de Bernard.[18]

III.

EPISTOLA EURARDI DE QUIBUSDAM ARTICULIS FIDEI DE HOMINE ASSUMPTO, DE DUABUS NATURIS ET UNA PERSONA CHRISTI ET DE PROPRIETATIBUS KATACTERICIS AD URBANUM PAPAM III. *Domine Dominus noster, quam admirabile est nomen tuum . . .*[1] Prologue où est fait l'éloge du pouvoir pontifical et après lequel est précisé l'objet de la lettre:

Sed ut omittam hereses fere per uniuersum mundum a laicis et inter laicos exhortas, non possum silere errores quorumdam in theologia studentium, Parisius et alibi theologiam docentium siue discentium, quorum quedam

---

[15] Cette épitaphe est différente des deux qui sont publiées dans *Gall. christ.* II (Paris, 1873), col. 1178.

[16] Ces deux tendances et ces deux formes de culture sont celles que j'ai caractérisées sous le titre: 'L'Humanisme bénédictin du VIII^{e} au XII^{e} siècle', *Analecta Monastica* I (Studia Anselmiana, Rome, 1948), 1-20, en particulier 7-10: 'La scolastique et la culture monastique'.

[17] Le défenseur même de Bernard, Evrard, avoue que Bernard a pu accuser Gilbert d'hérésie, mais non le convaincre: *conuenire, non conuincere.*

[18] Les extraits édités ci-dessous suffisent à donner le cadre où s'insère la discussion et les articulations de celle-ci; les références précises doivent permettre de retrouver les passages qui ne seront pas édités, mais dont les rubriques, reproduites en italique, telles qu'elles sont dans le manuscrit, indiquent le contenu.

[1] *Ps.* viii, 2.

pertinent ad Trinitatem, quedam ad Christi personam, quedam ad Christi naturam.

Ad Trinitatem hoc modo: Inquiunt quidam: "Paternitas est Deus", alii: "Paternitas non est Deus". At quantum periculum est affirmare Deum esse quod Deus non est, tantum periculum est Deum negare ipsum non esse quod ipse est. At isti affirmant de Deo quod isti negant; igitur alteri, etsi non alterutri, errant. Errantes uero a te reuocandi sunt . . .

Quod relatio non est Deus.—Oppositio.—Augustinus contra affirmantes paternitatem esse Deum.—Determinatio.—Ysidorus in VII libro Ethymologiarum.—(228^{v}) *Contra idem ait magnus Basilius . . .—Diuisio decem predicamentorum.—Tria prima predicamenta dicta de Deo diuinam predicant essentiam, cetera uero non.—Sunt tantum duo modi predicandi in theologicis.*

DE SECUNDO ERRORE SCIL. DE PERSONA CHRISTI. *Maxima naturalis facultatis. Nestorius fuit deceptus.*

Nostri uero parisienses damnatam heresim audientes concedere duas personas esse Christum, nomen pluralitatis reiciunt, sed significationem admittunt.

Nota hic errorem de persona quod filius Dei sit pars cuiusdam persone . . .—De distributione subsistentium et subsistentiarum . . .—(229) *Quod hoc nomen Christus equiuocum sit secundum quosdam.*

DE TERTIO ERRORE QUI EST DE CHRISTI NATURA.—*Eutices fuit deceptus maxima naturalis facultatis.*[2]—*Auctoritas Hilarii de natura cui natura non inesse nec non conuenire non potest.—Probatio quod una humanitas fuerit in Christo— . . .—Inconuenientia que sequuntur quod negatur esse humanitas in Christo.*

Item papa Alexander audiens abusiones que procedebant ex hoc quod negabant hoc nomine homo aliquid attribui Christo et quod Petrus et Christus non fuerunt uere duo homines nec Christus dicebatur eodem modo homo quo ceteri homines et quod in illo triduo ita fuerit homo sicut ante et post, precepit ut diceretur Christus esse aliquid secundum quod homo.[3] Auctoritati igitur domini pape cedentes dicunt: Christus est aliquid secundum quod homo, sed perperam exponunt sic: aliquid id est alicuiusmodi, et est nouissimus error peior priore. Cum igitur in sensu conueniant cum euticianis, licet differant in uerbis, semieuticiani dicendi sunt.

Pater, ii sunt errores qui a Parisiensi ciuitate deriuati fere per uniuersum orbem seminantur. Ii sunt errores per quos pusilli et magni scandalizantur, et cum quidam illorum panem sane doctrine esuriant, non euangelizantur. Nam etiam etsi aliqui sint qui eis sanam doctrinam proponant, tamen quia aliter didicerunt, eos audire nolunt. Nam perdere nolunt senes quod iuuenes didicere, et nemo est cui fidem de fide adhibeant nisi tibi. Ideoque a finibus terre ad te clamandum[4] iudicant. Pater hos errores in scholis existens audiuisti et inter taliter errantes conuersatus fuisti, et licet tunc haberes scientiam et uoluntatem emendandi, quia tamen non habebas auctoritatem, non correxisti. Sed cum nunc nomen tuum admirabile[5] sit factum in uniuersa terra et magnificentia tua sit eleuata super celos, id est super sanctos et prudentes uiros gloriam Dei enarrantes,[6] nunc a Domino sublimatus et ad fidei catholice instructionem conuersus, confirma fratres tuos[7] a finibus terre ad te clamantes[8] in petra a te et per te exaltari[9] desiderantes, in fide Christi confortari[10] exspectantes.

Pater, non hec propono coram hac reuerenda sede quia tot et tantos uelim accusare de fide, sed ideo quia nolo eos diuturnitate silentii suo errori prescribere, uel quia uolo a te corroborari in fide, ut iure possim uti uerbis Prophete dicentis: *A finibus terre ad te clamaui, dum anxiaretur cor meum in petra exaltasti me,*[11] et in fide Christi corroborasti me.

---

[2] Dans le texte correspondant à cette rubrique, il est dit à propos d'Eutychès: Cui concordant quidam parisienses. Dicunt enim Christi unam solam naturam, scil. diuinam . . .

[3] Alexandre III, *Epist. 'Cum Christus'*; Mansi, *Concilia* XXI, col. 1081.

[4] Cf. *Ps.* lx, 3.

[5] Cf. *Ps.* viii, 2.

[6] Cf. *Ps.* xviii, 1.

[7] Cf. *Lc.* xxii, 32.

[8] Cf. *Ps.* lx, 3.

[9] Cf. *Ps.* xxvi, 6; lx, 3.

[10] Cf. *I Cor.* xvi, 13.

Hec est igitur petitio mea ut omissis ad tempus questionibus temporalium, accedas et ascendas ad cor altum[12] et intendas solutionibus harum questionum, et qualibet septimana, dum uacare potes coram te disputari facias de theologia, donec Parisiensibus scribens diffinias utrum paternitas sit Deus, utrum relatio sit diuina essentia, utrum aliquis homo incepit esse Deus, utrum due substantie sint Christus, utrum una sola forma substantialis sit in Christo . . .—(229^r).

Pater mi, pater mi, currus Israel et supportator religionis christiane *et auriga eius*[13] et gubernator fidei catholice, intende et attende quanto labore, quanto studio et quanta diligentia antiqui patres et sancti extirpauerunt hereses nestorianam et euticianam, et cum tibi constiterit prenominatos theologos in damnatas hereses incidisse, sufficit hoc clero denuntiare et ueritatem catholice fidei proponere, scilicet unum tantum subsistens et unam tantum substantiam esse Christum et ita unam solam personam et duas subsistentias id est duas essentias esse in Christo et ita duas naturas . . . .

Suit un extrait de Boèce sous cette rubrique:

Boecius in libro de consolatione
O qui perpetua mundum ratione gubernas . . .
. . . Euolet aut mersas deducant pondera terras.[14]

Puis Dialogus Rascii et Eurardi. Suo suus pulsanti uel leniter, licet non leuiter, aperiri.[15]

Sepe et multum mihi cogitanti de celesti norma et forma uiuendi monachis proposita et de quorumdam animorum ceruice indomita, de scala Iacob ad celum erecta per humilitatem ascendenda et de eiusdem scale descensione propter elationem,[16] semel superuenit meus Ratius Atheniensis, uir uirilis animi, apprime in omni facultate eruditissimus qui more suo iocose sic mihi inquit: Frater Euerarde, studiis accingere tarde. *Nescio quid tecum graue cornicaris inepte.*[17]—Ad quem erecto capite: Rati, optato aduenisti, sed non optato incepisti, utpote a calumnia. Nam non cornior inepte, sed meditor apte.

R(atius)—Meditaris quidem, sed *in meditatione tua non exardescit ignis*[18] qui tam cito in modico commoueris uerbo . . .

E(uerardus)—Cum itaque sim monachus et non poeta, tamen prodesse uellem, si possem, uel mihi. Ideoque placet mihi delectari in iocunda consuetudine et gaudere in dicendo idonea regularis uite . . . Dicam tibi, a te cupiens erudiri, cui sepius in ariopage eruditor sedisti.

R.—Dic.

E.—Dicam, sed non est mora libera mihi, quia campana ad uespertinum uocat me officium, et anxior quia hospes es, tuum ueritus abcessum.

R.—Ne timeas, bene et plene tuum poteris prosequi propositum ante meum discessum. Vade itaque et cito redi.

Ego itaque abiens, apud me dicebam: Dicam huic hospiti ea que mente paulo ante uoluebam. Dicam equidem, nam ipse conscius est eorum que apud claustrales cuiusuis ordinis et habitus aguntur. Dicam non causa diffamandi aliquos, sed in dubiis me confirmandi. Nam ecce presto est noster Ratius.

---

[11] *Ps.* ix, 3.
[12] Cf. *Ps.* lxiii,7.
[13] *IV Reg.* ii, 12.
[14] *De Consol. philos.*, l. III, metr. IX.
[15] Cf. *Lc.* xi, 10.
[16] Cf. *Regula s. Benedicti*, cap. VII.
[17] Perse, *Sat.* V, 12.
[18] Cf. *Ps.* xxxviii, 4.

R.—Dic, Eurarde, si quid habes.

E.—Habeo aliquid aduersum te[19] quod me appellas simplici nomine, cum regula nostra iubeat aliquid adici nomini cuiuslibet monachi.[20]

R.—Istud regulare dicas ratibus, non mihi. Ne autem detineas diem uana loquendo euntem,[21] quod dicturus es, dic citius.[22]

E.—Patienter audio te arguentem me uanitatis. Quero igitur a te unde tanta sit dissonantia inter regularem et conuentualem monachorum institutionem et cotidianam conuenticularem quorumdam (230) conuersationem, quod et exprimunt per indiscretum, murmuriosum, susurroneum et contumeliosum sermonem, et unde tanta discordia inter suam professionem sanctam et habitum exteriorem et habitum mentis interiorem. Unde beatus Bernardus ait: "Tepescimus processu temporis a feruore religionis et nostre conuersationis paulatim refrigescit caritas . . ."[23] (En marge cette rubrique: *De reprehensione monachorum facta a patre nostro beato Bernardo.*)

R.—Numquid ego monachus sum ut iudicem de moribus monachorum? *Tractent fabrilia fabri.*[24]

E.—Es monachus uerus quidem mentis uirtute, licet non habitus professione, et peritus quemuis cuiusuis ordinis in suo ordine instruere . . . Precepit beatus Benedictus ne ea que quis audiret in seculo referret in claustro.[25] Sed quouis adueniente uel abbate uel monacho, conuenticulum fit, circumsedetur a monachis, de uisis et auditis in seculo, de rumoribus uagis, de principibus terrarum, de prelatis ecclesiarum questio fit. Hospite igitur referente conticent et se continent omnes intenti, quia ora tenent; quod si quis moueret uerbum de diuinis operibus sanctorumue scripturis, statim insurgeretur in eum questionator, disputator quasi malefactor iudicaretur, cum nusquam legatur inhibitum ab aliquo sanctorum patrum questiones fieri theologie uel de bonis moribus et de iis disputari.

R.—. . . Barbaries uidetur aliquibus monachorum quidquid alicuius scripture resonat subtilitatem; quod autem quis non intelligit fastidit et odit etiam intellecta, in quibus non consueuit abhorret. Redit enim quis libenter ad consueta, quia consuetudo quasi altera natura.[26] Unde stoïcus:

> Naturam expellas furca, licet usque recurret.[27]

Inde est quod dissueti scripture otiosa pro consuetudine sequuntur uerba, studiosi uero tam monachi quam laici, tamen litterati, litteraturam et litteratos diligunt et uenerantur. Unde Boetius in Hebdomadibus suis: *Omnis diuersitas discors, similitudo uero appetenda.*[28] Inde est quod quidam monachorum, nigrorum dico, adeo impatientes, adeo iracundi, adeo elati, adeo ad contumeliam inferiorum proni sunt ut etiam seculares in hoc antecedere uideantur, in hoc prelati monachorum utriusque habitus, et forte plures, plurimum redarguendi quod traditiones suas nimis mandant custodiri, instituta uero regule a beato Benedicto tradite multi non multum attendunt preteriri, ut de humilitate tenenda et de fraterna pace obseruanda.

E.—Satis, ex parte tamen, assentio uerbis tuis. Nam hac consuetudine inductus quidam monachus nomine Hugo tria obiecit mihi displicentia, licet gestu et habitu uideretur religiosissimus, scientia et moribus multum commendatus . . .

Rubrique: *De uera humilitate . . .*

R.—Sed inter claustrales quoque, ubi tales (humiles) inueniuntur?

---

[19] Cf. *Mc.* xi, 25.

[20] *Regula s. Benedicti*, cap. LXIII.

[21] Cf. Ovide, *Met.* I, 683.

[22] Cf. *Io.* xiii, 27.

[23] *Sermo in Annuntiat.* III, 9; PL 183, 397. Les mots *religionis* et *nostrae* manquent dans le texte de s. Bernard.

[24] Horace, *Epist.* II, 1, 116.

[25] *Regula s. Benedicti*, cap. LXVII.

[26] Cf. Macrobe, *Sat.* VII, 9, 7.

[27] Cf. Horace, *Epist.* I, 10, 24.

[28] Boèce, *Quod substantiae in eo quod sint bonae sint;* PL 64, 1311C.

Inuenti iure laudantur, sed rari fient et fere omnes se reprehendi grauantur. Corripe imperatorem, regem, apostolicum uel alios minores principes: conferunt et bene ferunt. Corripe quosdam claustrales: statim indignantes te persequuntur . . .

Rubrique: *De hoc quod spectat ad prelatum . . .*

E.—Loquebar de quibusdam ad me attinentibus cum abbate Monasteriensi. inter que cum dicerem me fuisse clericum in Francia domini Iacincti, nunc pape, affuit prefatus Hugo dicens: Nunc id scimus. Adiecit nullos inuitos a Deo trahi, probans hoc sic: nam ad hoc ut homo trahatur exigitur libertas arbitrii . . . (230^{v}).

La discussion s'engage sur le libre arbitre. Rubriques: *Diuisio patientie.—Descriptio patientie.—Differentia inter diffinitionem et descriptionem.—Descriptio uirtutis.—Tullius: uindicta est uirtus.—Nota quod quandoque uitium est patientia.*—(231) *Diuisio scientie iudicum.*—

Hic incipit principale propositum controuersie habite inter beatum Bernardum et magistrum Gillebertum.

E.—Prefatus monachus nomine Hugo sequenti die opinionem suam retractans, me presente, quesiuit a me causam dicti magistri Gilleberti Pictauiensis episcopi negantis Deum esse essentiam uel deitatem suam et cetera in hunc modum . . .

Commendatio magistri Gilleberti Pictauiensis.

R.—Subit mihi memoria illius summi uiri et acutissimi philosophi Gilleberti iocunda quidem, sed in hoc nimis superbi, quia humanam plus iusto contempsit laudem et gloriam. Inde est quod nolens condescendere capacitati plurium tam in legendo quam in scribendo minus studiosos, ita submouit ut sibi uideretur contumeliam diuine scripture uel etiam humane philosophie irrogare qui talibus hominum monstris non agnoscenda hec potius quam proculcanda proiecit indignosque eos iudicauit uel ad ea audienda uel legenda, qui uel callidi liuore uel ignaui segnitie intellectu capere ea nequirent . . . *De utilitate ex lectione scripti magistri Gilleberti proueniente* . . . qui etsi pauca scripsit, si quis ea duce Spiritu intellectus perlegerit, peritior in omni facultate hec intelligendo efficietur quam si omnem aliorum percurreret paginam; cuius scripta omnia et subtiliter ab eo excogitata, quia mundum fere totum tum propter ipsius segnitiem tum propter liuoris calliditatem eis indignum iudicauit, in bibliotheca mea Athenis sunt recondita, diuitiis Cresi mihi gratiora.

E.—Audiui quia auditor ipsius fuisti.

R.—Fui equidem, unde et gaudeo et semper gaudebo: ad quem audiendum mater mea, cuius nomen Ratio Atheniensis, consilio Sophie, mee sororis, me in Franciam misit; cui Carnoti quartus in lectione,[29] Parisius in aula episcopi fere tercentesimus[30] assedi, et ipsi episcopo Pictauis adhesi usque ad ipsius obitum; qui me docente grecam nouam[31] linguam, ego quoque ipso latinam. Cui sepulto superscripsi hoc breue epitaphium:

> Irriguum fontem siccat aquosa dies,
> In mense enim aquarii quod terre gesserat
> Terre reddidit, quod celi celo.[32]

Qui si sic in Grecia sicut in garrula enituit Francia, nomen celebrius etiam nostro Platone iure obtinuisset. Qui desides nimis reliquit heredes potius gule et uane glorie apparentie quam uere scientie insistentes, a quibus etiam nedum alienis nondum est intellectus. Ipse enim ultra hominum fere euolauit intellectum.

---

[29] Le manuscrit porte *lectionem.*

[30] Ainsi dans le manuscrit; peut-être faut-il lire *trigesimus.*

[31] Le manuscrit porte *nouum.*

[32] Ces vers font allusion au signe du zodiaque appelé le Verseau (*Aquarius, Amphora*); le soleil entre dans la constellation de ce nom vers le 20 janvier et en sort environ un mois plus tard. Pourtant, Gilbert de la Porrée mourut le 26 novembre, 1154.

E.—Rati, irrationabiliter flere noli . . .

Si uis festinare ad questionum solutiones, hic incipe ceteris pretermissis.—Inuocatio diuini auxilii. Hic incipit solutio cur dicatur Deus non esse sua essentia.

De nominis causa: unde, cui et ad quid sit impositum.—(231^v) *Priscianus de uerbi significatione.—Aristoteles.—Diuisio uerborum.—Distinctio nominum.—De nominis in propria positione ad significandum.*—(232) *Cur Deus sit uere simplex subtili ratione ostendit.—Qualiter in qualibet facultate negotiandum sit.—Nota theologiam bipertitam.* In diuinis uero que non modo disciplina uerum etiam re ipsa abstracta sunt intellectualiter uersari opportebit id est ex propriis theologorum rationibus illa concipere, non ex naturaliter concretorum aut disciplinaliter abstractorum proprietatibus iudicare. Diuina autem dico que circa sanctam adtenduntur Trinitatem, non ea que ad bonos mores scilicet ad merita uel premia pertinent, nisi premium uoces ipsum Creatorem. (En face de ce texte se trouve cette rubrique: *Ex ignorantia huius sententie fere omnes theologos falli.*)

Questio obscura de obscuro.—Solutio.—(232^v) *Quid sit species generis et quid indiuiduorum sit species.—Incipit solutio cur dicatur: Deus non est deitas.*—(233) *Diuisio modorum predicandi de Deo.—Quod relatio non est diuina essentia.—Quod Deus est sapientia.—Isidorus quod Deus non est relatio, sed est sapientia quam habet.—Inuectio in catholicorum hereticos:*

. . . Qui autem inde dubitat non tantum pena, sed sensu indiget, quamuis quidam dicant paternitatem, filiationem esse Deum, quasi Deum blasphemi. Illos de ipso profitentur errores quorum nomina diffitentur qui, ut ita dicam, hereticorum catholici in Sabellii, Donati, Pelagii et aliorum huiusmodi pestilentium uerba iurati eorum nomina eoque publicis edictis damnata noscuntur, cum catholicis detestantur, ut cum blasphemiarum causis sint iuste damnabiles, blasphemorum detestatione putentur indemnes; homines sine ratione rationatores, sine doctrina doctores, artium ignari, nimirum a uia ueritatis exorbitant et ideo pro uero falsum et e conuerso reputant et quod bonum est malum iudicant, communia artibus appropriant, propria communicant, et uim uerborum ignorantes tamen de significationibus eorum iudicare presumunt, et que de Trinitate personarum et de unitate essentie earum predicantur confundunt, omnia uocabula de Deo dicta essentiam predicare autumant, non discernentes nec aliquando discentes quod nominum de Deo predicatorum quedam figurant essentiam ut Deus, quedam relationem ut Pater . . .

De diuersitate eorum que de Deo dicuntur.—Haec uero que dicta sunt contra scolares theologos qui omissis gradibus doctrine theologiam ignorantes docere presumunt nemo arbitretur contra beatum Bernardum dicere.—Habite de relatione utrum sit Deus prime questionis solutio.—Catholice sensit et scripsit obiecto. (233^v)—*Prima questio de paternitate soluta est.*—

De secunda questione scil. quod Deus non sit diuinitas. Prima ratio quod Deus non est diuinitas.—Quod Deus sit incomprehensibilis.—Prima ratio.—Quod affirmationes in diuinis incompacte negatiue uere, ait Dionisius.—Nota secundum hoc non aliud deitas quam Deus . . .—Tertia ratio.—Quarta ratio.—Quinta ratio.—(234) *Ut transitio notetur.—Nota improprie dici diuinam essentiam patri uere.—Sexta ratio.—Quod una persona secundum Sabellium sit Trinitas.—Septima ratio.—Vtrum hoc nomen Deus et deitas sint synonima.—Quod Deus non habet proprium nomen.—Quid sit actio, unde ui.—Solutio questionis cur Deus non habeat proprium nomen.*—(234^v) *Auctoritas Dionisii quod non quid sit, sed quid non sit significatur.—Quod excellentius* *et potentius de Deo dicitur: non est quod est.—Quod de Deo aliquid dici potest, ipse non potest.—Oppositio Eurardi: quod Deus habet proprium nomen.—Isidorus quod nomen Dei sit tetragrammaton.—Solutio.—Probatio quod hec nomina Deus, deitas, non sint propria nomina: probatur quod nec appellatiua.—Quod diuersarum rationum et significationum nomina diuersis de causis Deo attribuuntur.—Ninus fuit prima causa idolatrie.—Oppositio quod Deus habet esse.—*(235) *Quod translatio fit a naturali facultate ad theologiam ipsorum nominum.—Causa dicendi Deum esse sapientiam, scientiam etc.—Hic dicit magister Deum simplicem cum dicat beatus Bernardus hoc ipsum negare.—Oppositio est quod Deus est essentia.—*

R.—. . . Ecce campana prandii uocat te. De cetero autem tibi me aliquid soluturum ne expectes. Surgamus et abeamus.

E.—Cras redi.

R.—Amplius non redibo. Vale, recedo.

E.—Nunc scio quod impatiens es ire. Hec consuetudo doctorum quando questionibus arcantur, impotentes soluere rationis responsione, soluunt, immo effugiunt, ire et indignationis ostensione. At contra qui peritus est in solutione gaudet oblata sibi soluendi opportunitate, et hoc ideo quia in contradictione exercetur sapientia.

His inter me et amicum meum actis adest nuntius significans magne auctoritatis adesse prelatum. Fratres igitur de hospitio dira nouitate perculsi, festinant piscatoribus auditum sed dirum insinuare rumorem; capiuntur pisces parui et magni, sed inter eos capi uoluit piscis authenticus tante auctoritatis uentre dignus. (Rubrique en marge: *Reprehensio castrimargie*). Viuus est aspectui tanti patris et pastui oblatus, ut prius delectaretur oculus et sic suauior excitaretur appetitus sicque deuotior prepararetur admirabili lucio uentris tumulus, non sine aromatum mixtura tumulando. Affuit forte noster Ratius et attendens diligentiam prelati diligenter piscem attendentis et sollerter inquirentis utrum potius frustra secaretur an integer elixaretur aut certe condimento aromatum uentri eius incluso assaretur. At domestici sui ipsum incathedratum circumstantes diuersi diuersa sentiunt, questiones propositas sollerter soluunt et cauentes studiose ne a sententia domini sui in aliquo dissentiant. Tunc Ratius uisu et auditu recreatus ait mihi: Euerarde, Euerarde, he questiones circa lutium, immo de lucio, proposite, tue questioni sunt dissimiles qua querebas: Qua ratione diceretur Deus solus uere esse et Deus causaliter esse et Petrus uere esse.

E.—O discretissime, quantum studium tuum semper diuersum fuit a studio prelati cuius animus intentus est patinis, immo semper est in patinis, tuus semper in disciplinis; suus querit quid bene sapiat palato corporis, tuus quid bene sapiat palato mentis. Hac igitur curiositate omissa gule, sis curiosus circa solutionem questionis theologice nunc ad memoriam tibi reducte . . .

Cur solus Deus uere tamen taliter esse dicitur.—Qualiter solus Deus uere esse dicitur et taliter et Petrus uere.—Octaua ratio.—(235^{v}) *Quid significet subiciendo uel predicando nomen mathematicum et concretum.—Nona ratio.—Nota hoc inductum fuisse contra magistrum quod magis pro ipso facit.—Causa cur non sit uerum: Deus est Pater et Filius.*

R.—. . . Sed dicunt quidam hac propositione: Deus est trinitas, fieri mentionem de diuina essentia ut hoc nomen Deus in qualitatem faciat et sicut ista est uera: Essentia diuina est trinitas, ita et hec: Deus est trinitas. Utramque igitur magister negauit, et hec una causarum quapropter Deus negatur esse essentia et ueritas et similia propter inconuenientia et heresim damnatam que inde sequitur si hec trinitas est essentia et eius simplex conuersa concedatur, licet apud sanctos patres huiusmodi locutiones sepius inueniantur . . .

De distinctione lexim, resim et sintasim.—Oppositio ad hoc quod dicitur: deitas est trinitas.—Quod dicimus Deus est Deus.—

R.—. . . Videturne tibi, frater Euerarde, disputatum satis super hac questione utrum Deus sit deitas, sit sua essentia?

E.—Sufficienter et satis rationabiliter et, ut uerum fatear, non est quid refragari debeat. Restat tamen ut respondeas argumentis et rationi beati Bernardi qui nunc est uere et iuste in catalogo sanctorum, cuius assertioni auctoritatem addidit spectata et approbata sanctitas fere a cunctis.

R.—Nota unicuique artifici in sua facultate credendum ut logico in logica, geometre in geometria et fabro in fabrateria et theologo in theologia. (En marge: *In quibus peritus fuit beatus Bernardus*). Sed iste sanctus de quo est sermo, nullius artis artifex inuentus, in artibus exercitatus parum, in questionibus theologie nihil, in moralibus uero theologicis multum. Inde est quod de questionibus artium uel theologie tantum non ei quantum exercitato credendum, quia, ut dicitur, iuuenis (236) a studio artium prudenter indoctus recessit, in qua etate ad theologiam audiendam non ad aliquem theologie doctorem accessit. (En marge: *Commendatio beati Bernardi*). Sed de morali facultate plurimum est ipsi credendum, in qua multum uiguit, ut in scriptis suis moralibus innotuit. Nam quod de fonte Spiritus Sancti plene hausit in sermonibus super Cantica canticorum conscriptis, per mellifluum et subtile et exornatum ipsius eloquium apparuit.

E.—Caue quid dicas dicendo ipsi non esse tantum in theologia credendum quantum credi debet in ea exercitato plurimum. Hoc est improbabile et opinioni religiosorum contrarium et manifeste falsum. Nam quomodo subtilitatem theologie ignoraret qui scientem omnia sciuit, cum quo unus spiritus fuit, cum Dominus de eo et similibus in euangelio dixerit: *Quecumque audiui a Patre meo nota feci uobis.*[33]

R.—Iterum ad disputationem uentum est. Vis probare mihi quod quia Veritas hoc dicebat, quicquid Christus nouerit nouerit et beatus Bernardus? Nam si quicquid Christus a Patre audiuit, Bernardo notum fecit. Sed quicquid ipse Christus sciuit a Patre audiuit. Ergo quicquid Christus sciuit, Bernardo notum fecit. Sed nihil Christus Bernardo notum fecit quod Bernardus non nouerit. Ergo Christus nihil sciuit quod sanctus Bernardus non sciuit. Ergo sicut Christus omnia sciens est, et beatus Bernardus. Hoc forte monachis suis persuadebis, at non mihi.

E.—Hoc ego non credo, scilicet quod aliquis tantum sciuerit quantum Christus.

R.—Ad quid igitur inducte sunt auctoritates tue?

E.—Ad hoc ut probarem ipsum plene et bene theologiam nouisse.

R.—Cum quinque sint facultates, scilicet naturalis id est phisica, mathematica, ciuilis, theologica atque rationalis, dic cur magis ei adiudicas scientiam questionum theologie absque studio et doctore sibi peruenire quam physice uel mathematice id est quadriuii, uel ciuilis id est rhetorice et legum peritiem, atque rationalis id est dialectice, cum hec scientia sit ceteris subtilior, grauior et usurpanti sibi periculosior; in aliis errare graue quidem est docto uiro opprobrium, sed in hac errare criminosum. Nam huius error heresim inducit.

E.—Et si theologie questiones ignorauerit, quomodo libros de theologia componere potuit? Quomodo tuum magistrum in pleno Remensi concilio ne dicam conuincere, sed de heresi conuenire preualuit? Cuius etiam argumenta contra ipsum tuum facta adhuc scripta reseruantur posterorum memorie.

R.—Sicut aliud est loqui de logica, aliud scire logicam, ita aliud est loqui de theologia et aliud scire theologiam. (En marge: *De practica et theorica*

[33] *Io.* xv, 15.

theologie). Sed scientia theologie duobus modis intelligitur, in practica et theorica, sicut cuiuslibet alterius facultatis. Theorica est scientia naturam rerum contemplans, cuius summa in symbolo continetur, scilicet articulos fidei, et ad questiones eiusdem ostenditur, quarum solutiones cum ipsis nonnisi longo doctrine studio habentur; cuius practica in scientia morum consistit,[34] id est in scientia recte uiuendi et scientia recte uiuere docendi. Hanc scientiam habuit sanctus Bernardus et beatus Martinus et beatissimus Benedictus et alii plures sancti quibus Christus nota fecit homo quecumque a Patre audiuit ad opus hominum, scilicet ad recte uiuendum et ad Deum habendum. Quod autem opponis quomodo sine scientia questionum theologie potuit summum theologum de heresi accusare: dico quod in hoc facto zelum Dei habuit, sed magistrum Gillebertum plene non intellexit nec causam dicti attigit et, sicut plerique sancti, aliqua se scire forte putauit que nesciuit, sicut Cyprianus magnus martyr et Origenes et Ieronymus et etiam magnus Gregorius qui contradicit Ieronymo in iudicando de principe grecorum qui detinuit angelum ad Danielem missum, quorum alter interpretatur de bono angelo, alter de malo.[35] Eodem modo quod circa dicta magistri Gilleberti uidebatur uerum beato Hilario non uidebatur uerum beato Bernardo. Attamen hoc non est tantum imputandum beato Bernardo quantum aliorum ad hoc ipsum inducentium presumptioni et arrogantie, qui quod non potuerunt intelligere putabant se intelligisse, quibus sanctus uir credidit, inductus caritate que omnia credit.[36]

E.—Vellem, si placeret tibi, ut mihi ostenderes quid beatus Bernardus intelligisse putauerit quod non intellexit de dictis tui Gilleberti.

R.—Hoc Boetius ait: "Qui homo uel qui Deus est refertur ad substantiam qua est Deus",[37] et magister euidentius adhuc determinans ait: non que est Deus.[38]

E.—Bone Rati, nisi rationabiliter apertius dixeris, nec est intelligibile quid ambo in hoc senserint.

R.—Acquiescam tue petitioni . . .

Quid sit predicari.—(236^{v}) *Euidenter hic ostenditur qualiter intelligendum: Deus homo refertur ad substantiam qua est Deus, non que est Deus. Cur dicitur Pater Deus, Filius Deus, Spiritus Sanctus Deus.*

R.—. . . Videturne tibi accusatio aduersus magistrum processisse ex ignorantia artium? Unde papa Eugenius: "Quomodo iudicabimus quod non intelligimus? Loquitur enim iste homo Deo, non hominibus". De magistro loquens Eugenius hec ait.[39]

E.—Huius controuersie inter prenominatos magne opinionis uiros habite causa fuit confusa significatio huius nominis substantia . . . Adhuc restat tibi parum addendum sufficientie solutionis.

R.—Quid?

E.—Respondere objectis a beato Bernardo in libro *De Consideratione* que uidentur facere contra hoc, scilicet Deus non est deitas.

R.—Quid dicam? Nihil ibi positum recolo dignum nodo. Magis enim est persuasorium quod ibi inducitur quam assertioni contradictorium. Non est argumentatio, sed quedam ornata persuasio ad quosdam. At quia uir talia inducens magne fuit auctoritatis et sanctitatis, rectus ac timens Deum,[40] suas rationes magistri contrarias inducam et earum instantias. Iste est modus opponendi sancti patroni tui: "Quid est Deus? Quo nihil melius cogitari potest . . ."[41] Item beatus Bernardus: "Multa dicuntur esse in Deo et quidem catholiceque, sed multa unum. Alioquin si diuersa putemus, non trinitatem habemus, sed centenitatem."[42] Hec ipse. (En marge: *Responsio uerbis beati Bernardi*). Ad hec ego: Cum de Deo predicentur relationes ut paternitas et creatio, rationes ut personalitas et indifferentia et diuersitas personalis et essentia ut deitas, beatus Bernardus inter hec non distinguens hec omnia dicit Deum esse . . . At Boetius scribens Ioanni romano diacono de istis specialiter que his nominibus, scilicet Pater, Filius, Spiritus Sanctus predicantur, ostendit illa et de diuersis Patri et esse diuersa non solum a se inuicem, uerum etiam ab essentia . . .[43]

---

[34] Le manuscrit porte *consistunt.*

[35] Cf. s. Jérôme, *Comment. in Danielem* X, 20; PL 25, 557; et s. Grègoire le Grand, *Moral.* XVII, xii, 17; PL 76, 20.

[36] *I Cor.* xiii, 7.

[37] Boèce, *De Trinitate* IV; PL 64, 1253B.

[38] Gilbert de la Porrée. *In Boetium de Trinitate;* PL 64, 1290B.

[39] A rapprocher des paroles qu'Othon de Freising prête à Innocent II: Multa, frater, dicis, multa et ea fortassis, quae a nobis non intelliguntur, legi facis . . . *Gesta Friderici; loc. cit.*, p. 82.

[40] Cf. *Iob* i, 8.

E.—Boetium non audeo arguere erroris nec beatum Bernardum. (En marge. *Commendatio beati Bernardi*). Cuius laus ubique preconatur de summa theologia, de quo uere predicatur quod plura didicerit orando quam disputando et plura sub fago quam in disputationis ariopago.[44] De tot disputatoribus tuis tam nominatis, tam exercitatis, ostende mihi uel unum cuius tam preclara, tam gloriosa extant opuscula sicut huius uiri sancti.

R.—Nescio quid concupitationis ingerit tam frequens commendatio a te facta de beato Bernardo, ac si dares intelligi me contra id quod dicis uel aliquid dicere uel opinari. Probabile enim hoc est quia id omnibus uel pluribus sapientibus notis atque precipuis in religione uidetur. (En marge: *Falsum imponitur magistro Gilleberto uel quod nunquam excogitauit*). Igitur absit quod aliter sentiam. Nec si aliquid sensit aliter de dictis magistri quam magister uel quam debuit, quod non dico, sed eis quos ipse abundans caritate, que omnia credit, credidit in delatione magistri fuisse ueraces, quia ipso garruliores sed non facundiores illius accusationis presumptores cuius non fuerunt intellectores. Mirandum est uero quod omnibus litterissimis Francie uiris episcopum in scriptis suis commendantibus, ausu temerario quidam monachi in accusatione tanti doctoris prosiliere, excepta et salua auctoritate sancti Bernardi per omnia. Nolo itaque quod tu uel alius dicat me in hac parte aliquid asserere contra scriptum uel dictum sancti uiri. Non est ita. Non enim sedeo Gilleberti defensor nec uiri sancti accusator, sed relator assertionis utriusque. Sic de me sentias.

Objectio uerbis beati Bernardi. Obicit adhuc sanctus de magistro et suis loquens: "Non multa, inquiunt, sed unam tantam diuinitatem que omnia illa sunt Deo ut sit . . .—. . . uel uni cognita uiro."[45] Hactenus beatus Bernardus. Ad hec ego salua auctoritate sua: Hoc magister numquam excogitauit quod duplex esset, cum ipse ut premissum euidentissime et subtilissime probet Deum omnimoda simplicitate (237) esse simplicem, nec asseruit Deum obnoxium alicui forme cui ut materia subsit. Hoc enim esset expositioni quam super hunc locum Boetii facit contrarium. Ait enim, ut superius dictum est: "In theologicis uersari oportet intellectualiter."[46] Post etiam rhetorico beatus Bernardus utitur argumento hoc modo: "Deus non partibus constat ut corpus . . ."[47] Ad hec, salua auctoritate eius, hec possunt dici: In hac ratiocinatione, immo in hoc sermone asserit beatus Bernardus uisum fuisse magistro Deum substare forme et quod Deus inclinet alteri beneficio se pro suo esse, id est humiliet. Ad hec ualde dubius respondeo: Nefas enim est asserere hunc sanctum aliquid contra ueritatem magistri dictis uel scriptis imponere. At in episcopi scriptis uel dictis nihil potest inueniri unde sensus hic elici possit . . . (En marge: *Obiectio contra*

---

[41] *De Consideratione* V, vii, 15; PL 182, 797.

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] Cf. Boèce, *De Una persona et duabus naturis* III; PL 64, 1345.

[44] Cf. Guillaume de Saint-Thierry, *Vita prima Bernardi* I, iv, 23; PL 185, 240D.

[45] *De Consideratione* V, vii, 16; PL 182, 797.

[46] Cf. Gilbert de la Porrée, *In Librum de praedic. trium personarum;* PL 64, 1304A.

[47] *De Consideratione* V, vii, 16; PL 182, 797.

beatum Bernardum.—Que sit essentia deitatis) . . . Ponit etiam pater monachorum unam clausulam de trinitate et unitate sic: "Dicamus itaque tres, sed non ad preiudicium unitatis . . ."[48] Hec ego audiens uehementer obstupesco. *Obiectio contra beatum Bernardum.* Ipse enim multum laborauit et laborando disputauit quod Deus esset sua essentia . . . Nec ignorauit quin Boetius trinitatem personarum naturalibus rationibus probaret atque singularitatem essentie theologicis contra diuersos hereticos, Nestorium scilicet et Eutices . . . Ad hoc est quod aliquotiens dixi: Quidam claustrales litterati, sed in scholis minime exercitati, quod in libris orthodoxorum patrum inueniunt in libris suis transcribunt, sed qualiter intelligendum sit nec sciunt nec inquirere a scientibus solliciti sunt, quia quod ipsi nesciunt qui sancti sunt, peccatores scire minime credunt.

E.—Si uerbis audacia daretur, dicerem mihi uideri melius in hac parte beatus Bernardus sensisse quam te uel magistrum tuum.

R.—Euerarde, duobus uitiis cares, et utinam sic omnibus, scilicet uitio adulationis et hyprocisis. Sed cum his careas, caue presumptionem indiscreti iudicii et precipitis, quoniam stulti dum uitant uitia in contraria currunt. Hoc tamen omisso, perge quod ceperas.

E.—Bonum est mihi quia meritorium patienter audire me uocari stultum, dum per hoc eligar a Deo meo. Nam stultos huius mundi elegit Deus ut confundat fortia . . .[49] (237^{v})

Quod Deus sit incomprehensibilis etiam angelis, ait Dionysius. At tuus, ut ais, philosophus e contra audenter asseruit et ueraciter docuit et se scire et probare testatus fuit quomodo sit una essentia trium personarum et tres persone unius essentie. Ergo ipse plus de Deo comprehendit quam alii homines uel angeli, quod noster abbas uere theologus se nescire, ut ceteri, perhibuit, humilibus consentiens et humiliter . . . Noster sanctus in quadam dicit omelia: "Sapiens est cui queque res sapiunt prout sunt, cui in se sapientia prout est sapit. Is non modo sapiens, sed beatus est. Hoc enim est uidere Deum sicuti est".[50] Quomodo tuus magister sciuit quod nec angeli ad plenum sciunt, quia nec Deum nec sanctum Trinitatem plene comprehendunt. Hoc igitur edoce et hanc questionem solue et eris mihi magnus Apollo.

R.—Solutio premissa est . . . *Trinitas est in unitate et trinitas in trinitate elocutio uera, locutio falsa.—Quod aliud scitur, aliud nescitur, aliud creditur.—Cur magister Gillebertus sic exposuerit hoc dictum Boetii: Deus est ueritas id est uerus.—Quid sit predicare.—Solutio cur ueritas id est uerus expositum sit a magistro. Differentiam inter locutionem et elocutionem.*— (238) *Questio prima.—Questio secunda.—Questio tertia.—Questio quarta.—Questio quinta.—Solutio prime questionis: de hoc uerbo est qualiter dicitur de creatore et de creatione.* (238^{v}) *Solutio.—Que fuerit causa controuersie inter episcopum et beatum Bernardum.*—. . . Quod enim secundum resim tantum iudicauit episcopus Pictauiensis uerum, secundum lexim et resim abbas Clareuallensis iudicauit accipiendum. Quod enim unus tropice dictum putauit, alter proprie . . . *Hic recapitulando ponuntur omnes questiones de quibus contra magistrum Gillebertum mota est controuersia a beato Bernardo.*

. . . R.—Sed iam auditurus es rumorem. Aperiat tibi Birria cursitando. Quid mi Birria, (239) quid sic asmatizas?

B(irria).—Otium et alienus cibus faciunt te derisorem; sed surge cito auditurus nuntium ab uxore tua tibi missum. Sosyas tuus ecce post me uenit, claudicando tamen, qui te foris, ego intus quesiui. Tu autem non inuentus repertus es.

---

[48] *De Consideratione* V, vii, 18; PL 182, 799.

[49] Cf. *I Cor.* i, 27.

[50] S. Bernard, *De Diuersis*, sermo XVIII, 1; PL 183, 587.

R.—Quomodo?

B.—Nam qui macer esse solebas, dilatatus es et inpinguatus cibis huius domus inflatiuis. Sed antequam transalpinaueris te mihi reddes. Equi uero tui iam pacifici sunt nec recalcitrant. Iam enim habent mansuetudinem propter dietam monachalem. Acrior ergo illos cura domat, scilicet famis. Sed dieta abbatialis larga et delicata recalcitrationem equinam in te conuertit. Factus enim ab hac es, ut mihi uidetur, sicut equus et mulus . . .

R.—Sosyas adest. Sosya, adhuc innitaris Iacob claudicando?

S(osyas).—Claudico quidem, sed non sum luctatus cum angelo, sed cum equo tuo qui iam non indiget freno . . .

R.—Eamus ergo.

E.—Quid? Infectam relinques petitionem meam de soluenda questione proposita? . . .

R.—Sosyas uero soluet tibi propositam questionem qui sedatum habet cerebrum, nec cogitando nec loquendo fatigatum ut ego.

E.—Nunc certe uilem me reputas et illitteratum qui dicis laicum mihi questionem soluturum.

R.—Ne indigneris quod laicus iste sit. Nepos enim meus est et filius sororis mee Sophie, apprime instructus a me. Nec cures quis te doceat, bene dum docearis . . . Sosya, doce hunc monachum quomodo hoc uerum: Deum esse et trinitatem esse unum Deum et similia sint ab eterno . . . Sed incipe a capite, scilicet a descriptione ueritatis posita ab Aristotele et a nostro doctore.

S.—Vis ut doceam indignantem Mineruam?[51]

E.—Audiam te libenter, quia audio te nouisse doctrinam doctoris nostri.

S.—Veritas sic describitur: Veritas est ratio substantie rei . . . *Descriptio ueritatis.*—(239^{v}) *Que rem esse faciunt et que probant tam in naturalibus quam in theologicis* . . . Unde summus philosophus noster, Pictauiensem episcopum dico, uere dixit . . . *Ieronimus de ueritate.—Quod ueritas duplex est: ueritas alia est moralis, alia rationalis.—Probatio quod Deus non est uerus Deus.—Auctoritates cur et causa cur Deus dicatur Deus.*—(240) *Quadrimembris diuisio ueritatis* . . . Sed Ratius adest.

R.—Frater Euerarde, est soluta questio tua?

E.—Est utique plene et plane,[52] sed nec leuiter nec breuiter. Sed beneficium solutionis obfuscauit maleficio insultationis, dicendo quod facerem in claustro rota quinta quod addita plaustro.

R.—Iocose dixit quia mos est grecorum iocosa interponere quandoque seriis, iuxta uerbum sapientis: Interpone tuis interdum seria ludis et e contrario,[53] et hoc causa recreationis.

E.—Scio et ignosco.

S.—Reuera serio dixi.

R.—Cur?

S.—Quia oneri est claustro.

R.—Quomodo?

S.—Propter diuersitatem studiorum. Nam, ut ait Boetius: "Omnis diuersitas discors."[54] Iste enim ex consuetudine habet docere uel doceri. Sed monachorum quasi professio est nec docere nec discere. Negligunt autem uerbum sapientis: Turpe est nil uelle doceri.[55] Item Euerardus insenuit studio litterature; nunc oportet ipsum operam dare agriculture uel omnibus odiosum esse. Dispar enim studium dissidium facit animorum. Mallent enim ipsum uel ligna secare, uel segetes metere, uel uindemiare quam dubitabilia theologie aut nodosa enodare. Nec si uellet liceret sibi unius dictionis significationem alicui interpretari; abhominabilis enim apud eos prudens disputatio, sed amabilis et commendabilis otiosa immo nugatoria locutio, licet eterna clausura damnetur a beato Benedicto[56] et a beato patre eorum, dicente Bernardo, in libro *De Consideratione*: "In ore laici nuge sunt nuge, sed in ore sacerdotis nuge sunt blasphemie".[57] Quomodo igitur in ore monachi sunt licite?

---

[51] Cf. Cicéron, *Acad. poster.* I, iv, 18.

[52] Le manuscrit porte *plene et plene*.

[53] Ps.-Caton, *Dist.* III, 6; ed. G. Némethy (Budapest, 1895): Interpone . . . gaudia curis.

[54] Boèce, *Quod substantiae in eo quod sint bonae sint;* PL 64, 1311C.

[55] Ps.-Caton, *Dist.* IV, 29: Culpa est nil discere uelle.

R.—Frater Euerardus humilitatem Christi imitatus est, qui cum esset liber factus est seruus, magis eligens partem Marie quam Marthe.

S.—Idem Parisius facere potuisset. Sed in hoc uidetur incredulus, quasi Deus in nullo loco nisi in claustro uellet uel posset gratiam misericordie sibi conferre, cum non sit ex meritis premium glorie.

E.—Sicut premium glorie non est ex meritis, ita non est sine meritis, sed cum meritis. Sed unde David: "Cum sancto sanctus eris et cum innocente innocens eris", ex hoc "cum electo electus eris"[58] in celo. Consequens prophetie relinquo Sosye qui mauult in seculo morari cum peruersis secularibus quam in claustro cum sanctis claustralibus. Igitur Sosyas si nouissime dicta et extremo tacuisset, non Sosyas sed Sophias mihi fuisset. Sed forte dissimulatorie loquitur, uolens admoneri fieri monachus.

S.—Adherebo ordini inuento immo precepto in paradiso, non instituto in monte Cassino uel in Cistercio, et non obliuiscar communionis doctrine et beneficentie operum misericordie . . . *Quod caritas nascitur ex eo quod quis docet et docetur.—Probatio quod quanto quis est melior tanto est doctior.—Disputatio de uita scholarium et claustralium* . . .

E.—Igitur cum ita sit, immo quia est, quomodo commendabilior est uita scholarium quam claustralium, quorum ordinata cohibetur disciplina non tantum manus, sed et lingua et animus? Qui in schola Christi insistentes dicunt cum David: "Quoniam non cognoui litteraturam, introibo in potentiam Domini. Domine, memorabor nominis tui solius . . ."[59] Unde beatus Bernardus: "Sapiens est cui queque res prout sapiunt . . ."[60] Confer ergo bonitati claustralium bonitatem scholarium: infirmatur monachus, unus uel duo custodes adhibentur sibi, diligenter lectum ipsius sternentes, pedes ipsius lauantes, aquam manibus et mensam cibis parantes, nocte et die, si opus est, ante ipsum uigilantes, cum magna deuotione et oratione devota premorientem inungentes (240^v) et uiaticum afferentes . . . At cum scholaris egrotat, quis obsequio ipsius assistit, nisi prediues sit? Quis admonet eum de sacramentorum perceptione? Solus famulus uel aliqua eius obsequio assueta claudit oculos morientis uel duo uel plures adsunt clerici. Quis ibi psallit? Ve soli! Proh dolor, sepius miserabilius decedit. Ecce commendatio, immo commendabilis uita scholarium. De fine uero quid dicam? Circa uiuos attende discipline rigorem. Peccat quis in conuentu uel silentium rumpendo, uel signum illicite dando, uel quicquam quod non debet agendo: qui publice peccat sic oportet ipsum publice penitere. Compara uigilias somnolentie, sobrietatem crapulis, ieiunia commessationibus, asperitatem uictus et uestitus deliciis secularibus et scholaribus, insuper pudicitiam impudicitiis, preter hec scientiam scientie, mansuetudinem iracundie, humilitatem elationi humane, et prefer preferendum preferendo . . .

R.—Ad hec respondeo: Tibi potius utramque uiam uiuendi experto credendum est, et quantum lumen solis precellit lumen quantecumque facis, tantum antecellit uitam religiosi et discreti claustralis uitam etiam boni secularis. Nam uita nostra multis uitiis est obuoluta . . . *De corrigendis in claustris.* At ut salua pace tua dixerim, multum erratur in claustris quod negligitur plus debito moderamen discretionis in rebus administrandis, et nimis amatores estis cuiuscumque consuetudinis uestre siue scripte siue in usum redacte, spiritualia euangelica precepta et beati Benedicti regularia dispensantes uel negligentes, scilicet de pauperum et hospitum receptione, de possessionis augmentatione et retentione et de talento multiplicando, de scandalo fratrum uitando . . . , de largitione elemosine in uia discipulo interdicte licet fame uel frigore egeno deficiente, de superfluitate equorum, edificiorum et agrorum, de desiderio uite et mortis timore, de illatorum immoderata coram iudice seculari repetitione etiam cum lite . . .

---

[56] *Regula s. Benedicti*, cap. VI.

[57] *De Consideratione* II, xiii, 22; PL 182, 756.

[58] *Ps.* xvii, 26.

[59] *Ps.* lxx, 15-6.

[60] *De Diuersis*, sermo XVIII, 1; PL 183, 587.

E.—Claustralibus hec cur imputas?

R.—Quia discreti talia non reprehendunt nec se murum pro domo Domini ponunt. At si Ioannes Baptista tam fuisset amator pacis et timidus offense maioris ut claustrales sunt iustitie pro defensione, gladio non succubuisset. At frater Eurarde, uale, constans esto. Videbis enim auxilium Domini super te.

E.—Mi Sosya cum auunculo, uale.

R.—Vale, frater Eurarde, uale. Si rediero habebis me comitem, non ducem in inuestigatione questionum trium facultatum quas proposuisti tractare.

Epistola

Doctori quondam egregio, nunc autem Dei gratia humili Christi discipulo Eurardo suo fratri carissimo, frater B.: ascendere de uirtute in uirtutem cantica graduum modulando.

Nouissima illa tempora que predixit Apostolus in nos arbitror deuenisse . . . Iam plerique sanam doctrinam non sustinent[61] quibus nuge lectiones, rumores sermones sunt, de regibus illis non de legibus questiones . . . Venit a foris quispiam rumigerculus, illi dicitur: "Tu sede hic bene". Illum honorifice fratres excipiunt, ab illius ore dependent, uersa facie, intentis oculis, arrectis auribus, et illo iactante friuolo aperiunt ora sua quasi ad imbrem serotinum. Hic sapiens, hic facundus, hic denique gratiosus homo reputatur et bonus. Intentissime auscultat monachus . . . Hiccine est preceptum Christi? Hec regula Benedicti? Hec doctrina Bernardi? Heu, heu filie Sion inclyti et amicto auro primo, quomodo reputati sunt in uasa testea opus manuum figuli?[62] (241)

Verum hec iam superfluo fortasse carpere uidear. Namque tu in dialogo tuo huiusmodi hominum monstra satis abundeque mordaci quadam elegantia pupugisti . . .

His omissis nos ad nostrum negotium accingamus . . . De medio fiat omnis iniqua suspicio, facessat indignatio, rancor omnis absistat. Non tentator accedo, sed motus meos gestio simpliciter aperire fratri et amico . . . Dum me igitur in locum altum et gratum otium contulissem, studiis spiritualibus nacta opportunitate me tradidi, licet ad breue. Quod otium tum in legendo tum in scriptitando consumpsi, si tamen dici debet esse consumptum: unum lucrum non minimum mihi gaudeo prouenisse, pretaxatum si quidem librum tuum grandi amore, multo studio, prout materie dignitas postulabat, legi relegique non semel, nam plus placebat lectio pluries repetita.[63]

In quo quedam offendi que a te potissimum censui requirenda, dilucidanda, plenius et planius enodanda. Pauca sunt autem in quibus forte, ut assolet breuitas obscuritatem, hec peperit phantasiam. Cum ergo tibi super auctoritate Ieronimi qua obieceras, introductus a te Ratius responderet: "Bene, inquit, opponis, putans easdem esse proprietates nominum et personarum". Sed non est ita . . . (241^{v}) Item miror quod uisum fuerit magistro Gilleberto ut non concederet simplicem conuersam huius: Trinitas est Deus, sicut nec huius: Quilibet trium est homo . . . Item in epistola tua ad Urbanum papam ponis oppositionem bonam contra illos qui dicunt Christum esse duas substantias Deum et hominem . . .

---

[61] Cf. *II Tim.* iv, 3.

[62] Cf. *Thren.* iv, 2.

[63] Cf. Horace, *De Arte poetica*, 365.

Quid tibi uidetur, o mi frater Eurarde? Iam te rebare quietum et in aurem accubare securum plerumque bonus dormitat Homerus.[64] Verum operi longo fas est surrepsere somnium.[65] Importunus tibi fortasse uidear aut molestus qui dilectam inter amplexus sponsi suauiter quiescentem suscitare presumo antequam uelit.[66] Verum magis mea me urget esuries et amici ad me de uia uenientis inedia que me a te mendicare compellit tres panes,[67] trium scilicet facultatum questiones quas proposuisti tractare Ratio comite. Expergiscere rogo, aduoca Ratium dispensatorem domus tue, excute horreum, aperi arcam, resera ostium, iube dari amico non modo tres, sed et quotquot habet necessarios. Ad hec amicorum omnia esse communia uetus sententia est.[68] Ergo de amicitia tua, immo uero de fraternitate presumens, tuli codicem tuum siue potius, ut regulariter loquar, codicem nostrum. Sed feci quod non debui deferendo: en quod debeo facio satisfaciendo. Ecce habes quod tuum est, si tamen quicquam tuum est. Non intres in iudicium cum seruo tuo.[69] EXPLICIT EPISTOLA FRATRIS B. AD FRATREM EURARDUM DE DUBITATIONIBUS IN SUPERIUS TRACTATO DIALOGO HABITIS.

---

[64] Cf. *ibid.*, 359.

[65] *Ibid.* 360.

[66] Cf. *Cant.* ii, 7.

[67] Cf. *Lc.* xi, 5.

[68] Cf. Térence, *Adelphoe*, 804.

[69] *Ps.* cxlii, 2. Cet article était en cours d'impression quand j'ai trouvé, dans le *Ms* Oxford, Corpus Christi Coll. 137 (XII^{e} s.), fols. 97^{v}-100^{v}, un autre témoin du texte publié ci-dessus d'après le *Ms Reg. lat.* 278 ce témoin n'offre pas de variantes notables, si ce n'est qu'il ne nomme pas l'évêque *Tornacensis;* en revanche, il donne une fois, au sujet de Thédoret: *Theodoricus grecus*.

The Meaning of *Est* in the *Sentences* (1152-1160) of Robert of Melun

PETER W. NASH S.J.

THE late Father Martin O.P. died without writing the general introduction to the *Sentences* of Robert of Melun.[1] He had intended doing so only after the whole of the *Sentences* had been critically edited.[2] It is deeply to be regretted that he lived to see the publication of only the first volume of this work.[3] Father Gallet O.P. had to finish the editing of the second volume. It is to be hoped that Father Gallet completes the editing and also gives us the long-awaited analysis of Robert's teaching.

Until the appearance of the remaining volumes it would, of course, be rash, merely on the basis of the first two volumes, to claim to be able to give Robert's definitive views. Yet, so incisive is his discussion in the second volume of the meaning of *est* as said of God and creatures, that it is hard to imagine him radically changing his solution later.[4] As it may be several years before the final editing of the entire *Sentences*, it might be of interest to evaluate Robert's solution insofar as it can be gauged from some ten chapters of Book I. It sheds much light on the twelfth century background to the later explicit disputations *de esse et essentia.*

Robert, like Gilbert de la Porrée, whom he frequently criticizes,[5] came to grips with the problem of the predication and meaning of *esse* and *est* through his reading of Boethius' *De Trinitate* and *De Hebdomadibus.*[6] He was certainly aware of the two interpretations of the Boethian *diversum est esse et id quod est* in Gilbert's commentary.[7] There was the view of the "theologians" that *est*, when used of God, signified the divine essence, and still signified that same essence when said of creatures. Only by extrinsic denomination could one say that man is: the *est* in this case referred to the divine principle or source. On the other hand, the "philosophers" interpret *esse* and *quod est* to mean created subsistence and subsistent respectively, e.g., humanity and man.

---

[1] R. M. Martin O. P., *Oeuvres de Robert de Melun* III, *Sententie*, vol. 1 (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovanense, 21, Louvain, 1947) and R. M. Martin O. P., and R. M. Gallet O. P., *Sententie*, vol. 2 (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovanense, 25, Louvain, 1952). Father Martin, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. vi, puts the composition of the *Sentences* between 1152-1160. According to the biographical sketch in *Oeuvres* I, pp. vi-xii, Robert was born in England in the closing years of the eleventh century. We first hear of him as a professor in the *Schola Artium* of Ste. Geneviève around 1137. There he succeeded Abelard. Robert went to Melun around 1142, where he taught theology with great renown. He attended the Council of Rheims, 1148, with Peter Lombard and attacked some of the theories of Gilbert de la Porrée. He seems eventually to have held a chair of theology at Saint Victor. He went to England in 1160, was ordained in 1163, and consecrated Bishop of Hereford. He showed up none too well in the dispute between Henry II and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas à Becket, though he seems later to have rallied to Thomas' views. He died at Hereford February 27, 1167.

In his *Sentences* Robert cites the following twelfth century authors (cf. *Sententie*, vol. 1, pp. 324-329; vol. 2, pp. 389-393): Abelard (1079-1142), Anselm of Laon (d.1117), St. Bernard (1091-1153), Clarimbaldus of Arras (whose commentary on Boethius' *De Trinitate* was written *ca.* 1153), Gaufridus (the secretary of St. Bernard), Gilbert de la Porrée (1076-1154), Hugh of St. Victor (1096-1141), Peter Lombard (whose *Sentences* were written 1145-1150 according to his Franciscan editors, cf. *Petri Lombardi Libri IV Sententiarum* I et II; I, edit. 2a, Florence, 1916, pp. xxxv-xxxvi), Walter of Mortagne (d.1174), William of Champeaux (1070-1121), William of Conches (1080-1145), William of St. Thierry (d.1148/1153), and at least seven of the current *Sententie* (namely *Divinitatis, Divine Pagine, Florianenses, Magistri Omnebene, Parisienses, Magistri Rolandi,* and *Summa Sententiarum*).

Robert had John of Salisbury as a pupil for two years at Ste. Geneviève and John of Courcailles at Melun.

[2] *Sententie*, vol. 1, p. v: Vu l'importance et l'étendue de cette oeuvre, on comprendre qu'il est impossible d'écrire dès maintenant l'introduction générale et complète qui ne peut manquer à une édition critique.

[3] Vols. 1 and 2 of the *Sententie* cover only 68 of 261 folios of the Bruges manuscript (Book I). Book II, which was never completed, takes up 96 folios of the Saint-Omer manuscript Cf. *Sententie*, vol. 1, pp. vi-viii.

[4] *Sententie*, vol. 2, part 5, chapters 45 to 55.

[5] He attacks Gilbert for his views on the divinity as the form of God, cf. *Sententie*, vol. 2, p. 241n; for his refusal to make use of *similitudines* in theology, cf. *ibid.*, p. 92n; for refusing to admit that, in the Trinity, *proprietates personales* are Persons, cf. *ibid.*, p. 163n; and on the question of the use of number with regard to the three divine Persons, cf. *ibid.*, p. 210n. Robert himself is going to make good use of *similitudines* to show how *est* can be said of God and creatures truly but not univocally.

[6] cf. Boethius, *Liber Quomodo Trinitas*, 2; PL 64, 1250: Sed divina substantia sine materia forma est atque ideo unum et est id

Robert, we shall see, investigates the meaning of *est* as said of both God and creatures. He follows neither of the views mentioned by Gilbert. With the aid of a keen dialectic, but without the benefit of a metaphysics of act and potency, he arrives at a position according to which he can admit that, while only God is truly (*vere est*), yet creatures can truly be said to be. That this position will leave the creature only a shadowy consistency does not worry Robert. He has discovered a way to use *est* in different meanings without making God in any way the *esse* of creatures. This way is a foreshadowing of the analogy of proportionality.

I shall give a running analysis of the pertinent chapters. This will, I hope, bring out Robert's vigorous dialectic as well as his doctrine.

The discussion starts with the problem of the exclusive eternity of God. This leads Robert into the investigation of the meaning of truth, which he finds he cannot answer until he discusses the meaning of *est* and the way attributes, such as 'good', 'just', seem to be predicated in common of God and creatures.

CHAPTER 45.[8]

The problem of this chapter is that raised by the eternity of truth, or rather of 'the true' (*verum*). The true is something, and there can be many 'trues' (*vera*). Now there are many things true which were just as true from eternity as they are now, e.g., God is (*Deum esse*), God is God, etc. Now none of these *vera* is God. So it would look as though God is not the only one to be from eternity, and hence not the only one to be eternal.[9]

Robert says that the difficulty stems from misinterpreting such expressions as *verum est, verum est aliquid, verum est verum*.[10] Despite the presence of *est*, these expressions do not signify a second *esse* distinct from that of the thing of which it is true to say that it is:

> Quid enim in ista: verum est, enuntiari de vero dicemus? Idem quod de homine enuntiatur hac locutione: homo est, an aliud? . . . Sint ergo ista:

---

quod est. Relinqua enim non sunt id quod sunt. Unum quodque enim habet esse suum ex his ex quibus est, id est ex partibus suis, et est hoc atque hoc, id est partes suae conjunctae . . . Cf. also Boethius, *De Hebdomadibus* (or *Quomodo Substantiae*): PL 64, 1311.

[7] Gilbert de la Porrée. *In Boethium de Hebdomadibus*, PL 64, 1317D-1318A: Secunda regula: *Diversum est esse et id quod est Ipsum enim esse nondum est: at vero quod est, accepta essendi forma, est atque consistit.* Hic notandum videtur quod diversorum philosophorum in diversis facultatibus usu diverso, esse et esse aliquid diversum dicuntur. Nam in theologia, divina essentia, quam de Deo praedicamus, cum dicimus Deus est, omnium creatorum dicitur esse. Cum enim dicimus corpus est, vel homo est, vel hujusmodi, theologici hoc esse dictum intelligunt quadam extrinseca denominatione ab essentia sui principii. Non enim dicunt corporalitate corpus esse, sed esse aliquid, nec humanitate hominem esse, sed esse aliquid, et similiter unumquodque subsistens, essentia sui principii praedicant non esse aliquid, sed esse. Illa vero quae in ipso creata est subsistentia non esse, sed esse aliquid . . . . . Ergo cum dicitur diversum esse et id quod est, secundum theologicos quidem intelligitur esse id quod est principium, id quod est vero, illud quod est ex principio; sed secundum alios philosophos, esse subsistentium solae illorum quae praedicantur subsistentiae; quae vero sunt, ea tantum quae illa in se habendo subsistunt.

[8] *Sententiae*, vol. 2, p. 256 ff. This is chapter 45 of Book I, part 5. I will not give the chapter titles, even though they are found in the manuscripts: they do not always fit, and not seldom give the impression that each chapter treats a separate topic, which is not the case. Also in quoting Robert I shall not change the archaic spelling of Father Martin's edition.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.*, line 8.

> Paulus est, hoc verum est Paulum esse. In his autem locutionibus non duo esse demonstrantur.[11]

"Paul is" and "True it is that Paul is" say the same thing. By the expression "Paul is", Paul is proposed to us as being, he is shown to be (*esse proponitur*). Whence it follows that: " 'That-he-be' is the same as saying 'true-it-be' (*scil.* 'that Paul be'); and this saying 'true-it-be' is the same as saying 'to-be truly belongs to Paul' ". That is the closest I can come to rendering the sense of the Latin: *Ipsum ergo esse, est hoc dictum verum esse, scilicet Paulum esse, et hoc dictum verum esse, est esse Paulo vere adesse.*[12] An important phrase is added to the sentence: *et convertitur.* The meaning, then, seems clear enough: it is simply the convertibility of *ens* and *verum.* Robert, however, has complicated matters by not being able to distinguish between what we would call logical and ontological truth. In later chapters he will say that truth is said properly of the spoken expression of thought.[13] It will be said of things with no change of meaning, because e.g. there is exactly the same reason why a prophecy is said to be true, and a prophet is called true.[14] Robert seems to have no inkling of the transcendentally true. The convertibility that Robert has in mind is that of the two expressions, "Paul is" and "it is true that Paul is": the second does not imply anything (*aliquid*) which is not Paul. So if only Paul existed, anything true about him would not posit any non-Pauline reality:

> Unde manifestum est, nichil esse quod Paulus non sit, licet hoc dictum, scilicet Paulum esse, verum sit, idem omnino hoc cum illo est. Unde nulla exigit ratio quod aliquid sit quod Paulus non sit, quia hoc verum est: Paulum esse. Multo ergo minus aliud erit quam Paulus sit, quia verum est hoc verum esse Paulum esse. Si enim verum esset solum Paulum esse, non esset verum aliud esse quam Paulum esse. Hoc nullus rationis particeps umquam negare presumpsit.[15]

The application to God and truths about God is obvious; Robert will make it in the next chapter.

What does *esse* mean in this chapter? He speaks of a statement not implying *duo esse*, and of *esse* being truly present to something. He knows that *est* in *verum est* adds nothing to that of *Paulus est.* But there is no hint of what *esse* means for the existent individual, of its constitutive role, if any. That is not his present concern. We may look for some light on our question in the following chapter, in which Robert claims to elucidate the problem of the eternal existence of something other than God by contrasting the nature of God and creatures.

CHAPTER 46.

So far Robert has treated the relation of *est* to *verum est* in the case of the creature. In the present chapter he says it is not exactly the same for a creature to be and for God to be. God is, but has not His being as a result of constitutive parts:

> Ut hoc vero melius intelligi possit, diligenti attentione inspiciendum est, quia aliud est aliquid ex aliquibus esse, et aliud aliquid esse. Quod inde constare oportet, quia non omne quod est ex aliquibus est. Verum omne quod ex aliquibus est, ipsum esse necesse est. Deus enim est, nec ex aliquibus esse habet.[16]

---

[11] *Ibid.*, lines 9-15.

[12] *Ibid.*, lines 18-20.

[13] *Ibid.*, chapter 56, p. 276, lines 15-17: Dicitur enim, propheta verus est, prophetia vera est, doctor verus est, doctrina vera est, locutio vera est, dictum verum est.

[14] *Ibid.*, lines 18-21: In his vero et in aliis istis similibus ratio significationis non surgit ex causis diversis. Nam non est alia causa quare propheta verus dicatur et quare prophetia vera esse iudicetur.

[15] *Ibid.*, c. 45, p. 257, lines 20-29.

[16] *Ibid.*, c. 46, p. 258, line 9.

What is not God is *ex aliquibus,* and, provided the constitutive elements are united, the *esse* of it has got to be there. That this is the meaning of the above is seen from the immediately following discussion of the nature of the creature, *scil.* Paul.

Paul's constitutive elements are body and soul, and it from these that he "has *esse*". The very union of these two confers *esse* on Paul. Now, lest we should anachronistically attribute to Robert the doctrine that *esse* is an act and a real principle of being, the reading of the next two sentences will show us that Robert was thinking of no such thing. He insists that for Paul to be is simply to have an individual soul and body united to make one person. On this union, on their being united (*coadunata esse*) it follows that Paul is (*Paulum esse*):

> At Paulus, cum sit ex aliquibus, esse habet ex anima scilicet et corpore. Horum namque coniunctio Paulo esse confert. Hoc quippe est Paulum esse, hec scilicet hanc animam et hoc corpus in unam personam coadunata esse. At ad hec coadunata esse in unam personam sequitur Paulum esse.[17]

The above provides Robert with the premises of the proof that the truth of Robert's being does not signify any new *esse,* any thing which is not Paul. Why is it true (*verum est*) that Paul is (*Paulum esse*)? Because soul and body are united (*hec coadunata esse*). But the latter fact is identical with Paul being: it means simply that Paul is. So the identity of *Paulum esse* and *verum est Paulum esse* is proved by the mediation of the *haec coadunata esse*:

> Inter ergo tale esse et esse, pluralitas nulla potest esse, nec unum et aliud inter ea esse potest; ex quibus necessario colligitur quia non est aliquid quod Paulus non sit: quia hoc verum est Paulum esse. Nam si idem Paulum esse et hec scilicet hanc animam et hoc corpus in unam personam coniuncta esse, nichil est quod Paulus non sit, quia hoc verum est Paulum esse, eo quod hoc Paulum esse aliud non est quam hec coniuncta esse, hanc scilicet animam et hoc corpus. At, ut dictum est, idem est Paulum esse et hec coniuncta esse.[18]

One cannot help noticing the Boethian provenance of this defining the creature by its compositeness.

For Boethius man is the composite of this soul and this body. Boethius characterizes every creature as *hoc atque hoc,* whereas God is only *hoc.* Once the component parts of a creature are united, there it is, it has *esse.*[19] Robert's use of *esse,* even as Boethius', does not imply any reality or principle apart from the essence. To be, for the creature, is to be composed. This is brought out further in Robert's application of the example of the truth about Paul to the problem of the truth about God.

As nothing new came into being, nothing non-Paul, as a result of it *being true* that Paul is, still less does anything non-divine, anything apart from God appear as a result of it being true that God is. The *a fortiori* argument derives its force from the fact that the creature, unlike God, has not a simple *esse.* Paul has not a simple *esse* "although this very *esse* which is simple is predicated of him." It is, as we saw, a plurality in Paul which grounds this "simple" predication of *esse:*

> Quis unquam tanta cecitatis caligine involutus fuit, qui etiam suspicari posset quod aliquid sit quod Deus non sit, quia hoc verum est Deum esse. Ratio itaque illa qua volunt probare quia aliquid est quod Deus non est quia hoc verum est Deum esse, facillime ex eo quod predictum est falsa esse

---

[17] *Ibid.,* lines 10-14.

[18] *Ibid.,* lines 14-23.

[19] Cf. *supra,* note 6.

> ostenditur. Nam si non ideo aliquid est quod Paulus non sit quia hoc dictum est Paulum esse, multo minus aliquid esse oportebit quod Deus non sit quia hoc dictum est Deum esse. Nam alia subest causa quare esse de Paulo enuntietur, et alia quare de Deo. Non enim Paulus esse simplex habet, quamvis hoc ipsum esse quod simplex est de Paulo enuntietur. Est quippe pluralitas quedam causa quare hoc ipsum esse quod simplex est de Paulo enuntietur.[20]

There is no such plurality in God: *Nulla namque pluralitas in Deo esse potest.*[21] As the plurality in Paul could not produce a plurality of *esse,* how could it possibly in God? Robert then goes on to ask: what do people mean in saying that God is?

Understanding the verb *est* as a substantive word, they appeal to St. Augustine as authority for saying that it applies properly to God alone.[22] But, Robert points out, the correlative is that it applies to others not properly, and it must do so. And this improper application cannot be a pure equivocation; there must be some community of meaning in its application to God and creatures.[23] The problem is: what community of meaning is possible? It is not enough that the word alone be the same. There is something in the meaning of *est* which makes it apply properly to God, improperly to creatures. Whatever it may be, for the moment he will concentrate on the meaning of *est* according to which it is predicated properly of God.[24]

There follows an appeal to *Exodus* iii, 14 The answer to Moses: *Qui est,* etc., was supposed to signify God in a clear-cut and proper manner. If it were not a proper sign Moses did not get the sign he asked for. So, if it had any application to other things, it would not have been a proper sign. And yet, objects Robert, I can say of myself: *Ego sum qui sum,* as I can say of another, *Homo qui est.*[25] Obviously determining the community of meaning in *est* is not so simple. Robert tackles this problem in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 47:

Is the meaning of *est* such that it applies to God alone or can it belong to creatures as well? If the latter, then there is the difficulty that arises from it being common to God and creatures, *scil.* that whatever God would have in common with creatures could not be God. As neither substance nor accident God cannot be either a property or the substance of creatures. Now it would be illogical to say that what is meant (*significatum*) by *est* belongs to God and yet cannot be God. The significance of *est* must be God by it's being in God.[26] As it is predicated of God, it must be God. *Est* is one of those words said of Him by intrinsic denomination (*ex ipso*), and not by reason of His external works:

---

[20] *Sententie,* vol. 2, p. 259, lines 1-12.

[21] *Ibid.*, line 13.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 259, line 18. Father Martin in a note corrects Robert's reference to Augustine, *Super Iohannem,* to Augustine's *De Trinitate* V, 2, 2 (PL 42, 912): sola est incommutabilis substantia vel essentia, qui Deus est, cui profecto ipsum esse, unde essentia nominata est, maxime et verissime competit.

[23] *Ibid.*, lines 17-26: Hoc vero verbum "est" verbum est substantivum, et quemadmodum beatus Augustinus *Super Iohannem* asserit soli Deo proprie convenit. Verum quare soli Deo proprie convenire dicitur nisi alii vel aliis conveniret, et non ita proprie. Hoc vero esse non posset, id est quod aliis conveniret et non ita proprie ut Deo conveniret. Sed non ita proprie sed in alia que eius propria non esset cum Deo in propria conveniret. Illud vero nullus umquam dicturus est quod Deo in nulla significatione conveniat.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 260, lines 1-9.

[25] *Ibid.*, lines 10-29.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 261, chapter 47, lines 1-14: Que vero erit vocis huius significatio "est" in predictis locutionibus, an talis, que soli Deo conveniat, an que Deo et aliis. Sed si cum rebus creatis Deus eam communem habet, eam Deo convenire qua ratione verum erit, nisi ipsa Deus non sit? Nichil namque quod Deo cum creaturis commune est Deus esse potest. Deus enim nec proprietas creature nec substantia est, eo quod nec substantia est nec accidens. At qua ratione significatum huius vocis "est" Deo convenire dicemus, si ipsum Deus non est? Significatum ergo huius vocis "est" Deum esse necesse est, eo quod et ipsum in Deo est. Cf. Robert's argument against Gilbert that *divinitas* cannot be a form whereby God is God, for it would not be God: cf. chapter 42, pp. 248-250. Cf. also *Questiones de divina pagina,* (*Oeuvres* I, p. 23).

> De Deo enim vere enuntiatur. Quod sequitur ipsum Deum esse. Est nempe vox ista 'est' una earum vocum que ei ex ipso conveniunt, et non ex his que ipse circa nos operatur. Unde, quemadmodum dictum est, necessarium est eius significatum Deum esse.[27]

There is no more reason why the meaning of *est* should have anything in common with creatures than 'good' does; God is and is good, a creature is and is good. Either both words or neither have a significance common to God and creatures.[28]

In the light of the foregoing Robert says it is no idle question to ask if words, which are said of God *ex ipso*, are used of us in the same sense. If they cannot be so used, what basis is there for the well-known degrees of comparison that hold between God and creatures:

> At super hoc nonnulla questio est, id est, an voces que ipsi Deo ex ipso conveniunt nobis in eadem significatione conveniant in qua Deus eas suscipere dicitur. Nam nisi hoc sit, id est, quod nos et ipse eas in eadem habeamus significatione, qua ratione comparationis aliquo gradu accepta inveniuntur.[29]

Robert gives three examples of such comparison. Our conformity to Christ means that we are like Christ, and, as He is the image of His Father, therefore we must have some likeness to the Father.[30] Also we are commanded to be merciful even 'as your Father is merciful'. This surely applies to the rest of the virtues; they must make the good like God. Finally, *Genesis* warrants us saying that every rational creature of its very nature (*ex ipsa sui conditione*) has the image of God in it. We read of 'spirit' being said of creator and creature; this could not be if 'spirit' did not carry the same meaning for both. It is much the same, apparently, for other words such as 'good', 'just', etc.[31]

Robert is trying to see whether identity of meaning can be saved without identifying God and creatures. He will find that it cannot.

CHAPTER 48.

It cannot be denied, he says, with regard to the words just mentioned there is a transfer from creator to creature or vice-versa through a similarity of meaning. He considers it no easy matter to show that there is this similarity. Is it something or nothing? If the likeness is of nothing, the transference of names is meaningless. If the likeness is something, then just what is signified?[32]

There are several types of likeness. The first is merely representational, such as the image of a man. A second is that of sign to thing signified. This can be because of external appearance or because of something intrinsic: *Est vero alia rerum significantium ad res significatas, que fit secundum exteriorem formam vel secundum intrinsecam naturam.*[33] Snow, signifying the pure soul, exemplifies the former; a herd of goats, signifying spiritual thoughts, the latter. A third type arises from participation in the same form: e.g., Peter and Paul are alike in their participation in justice.[34]

Now the representational and significative likenesses do not permit any comparing of their terms: you cannot, for example, say that snow is whiter than the soul, or that goats seek higher peaks than thoughts. This being able to compare things is important to Robert; as we saw, God and creatures are somehow compared from the viewpoint of justice, goodness, etc.

---

[27] *Ibid.*, lines 14-18.

[28] *Ibid.*, lines 19-32.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 262, lines 1-5.

[30] Cf. *ibid.*, part 3, c. 31, p. 92n.

[31] *Ibid.*, part 5, chapter 45, p. 262 to the end of the chapter.

[32] *Ibid.*, chapter 48, p. 263, lines 8-17: Nam, quemadmodum ostensum est, quin saltem ex similitudine significationis ad significationem a creatore ad creaturam vel creature ad creatorem assumantur negari non potest. . . . Si autem nullius similitudo hic nomen est, inaniter et falso ex similitudine hec nominum translatio fieri dicitur. At si vere similitudo aliquid hic est, neque hoc nomen "similitudo" non incassum, sed rem significatam subjectam habens in quo ipsa consistat inquirendum est.

[33] *Ibid.*, line 20.

[34] *Ibid.*, lines 18-28.

Now the third type of similarity, the participational, does allow comparison of the terms: Paul is more just than Martinus, God is more just than Paul. In fact, God is and is said to be the most just, which could not be said either properly or truly if anyone were His equal in justice:

> Tercia vero similitudo proprie capax est comparationis. Proprie namque dicitur quod Paulus iustior est Martino. At non minus proprie Deus iustior Paulo dicitur. Ipse quippe summe iustus est et dicitur, eo quod nec proprie nec vere diceretur si aliquis in iusticia ei equalis esse posset.[35]

Here the meaning of 'just' and 'good' does not vary, except in degree and intensity: *significatio variari non videtur, sed solum intendi vel remitti.*[36] Were there a diversity of meaning, comparison would be impossible, or, at least, so it seems. Robert immediately proceeds to show there is no good ground for that *videtur.*

Neither reason, nor faith, can approve this line of reasoning, nor can Scripture corroborate the implication that the aforesaid comparisons are based on participation in a common meaning.[37] If there is identity of meaning in the propositions "God is just" and "Paul is just", then it is God Himself who is signified in both, because the "just" in the first can designate only God. Now God is not just by participation in any property: He is just by His essence. God's essence cannot by any stretch of the imagination be predicated of Paul. The "just" in "Paul is just" cannot signify God. For then Paul's justice would be God:

> Que namque ratio suscipere potest quod hac voce "iustus" idem significetur in his locutionibus: Paulus est iustus, Deus est iustus. Nam si unum et idem in eis significat, Deum in utraque significabit, eo quod in ista: Deus est iustus, vox ista "iustus" solum Deum designat. Non enim aliquam in ea significat proprietatem cuius participatione Deus iustus sit, sed divinam essentiam que Deus est, quam de Paulo predicari non posse dubium esse non potest; neque in hac locutione: Paulus iustus est, hac voce "iustus" Deum significari aliqua ratione verismile esse possibile est.[38]

So, too, one would have to say that Paul is the highest good, which is impossible as then the *summum bonum* would be contingent.[39]

CHAPTER 49.

This chapter answers an objection. Some would say that the good predicated of Paul is the *summum bonum.* This goodness remains when Paul ceases to be, just as the light of the sun, which shines on Paul, will not cease when Paul ceases.[40] It is surely the same with the divine light that enlightens all men. And the same can be said for justice, faith, hope, and even the very reason and essence of Paul:

> Sicut ergo luce illa eterna omnes illuminantur que prius est quam illuminet, et postquam illuminare desinit non minus existit, ita esse potest, sicut quorundam estimatio habet, quod nec iusticia Pauli neque bonitas eius esse desinat quando Pauli esse desinunt, neque eas tunc incepisse esse necesse est, quando Pauli esse inceperunt. Quod de fide et spe Pauli dicere possunt; immo etiam de ipsius ratione atque essentia.[41]

---

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 264, lines 3-8.

[36] *Ibid.*, lines 10-12.

[37] *Ibid.*, lines 23-25.

[38] *Ibid.*, lines 25-34.

[39] *Ibid.*, p. 265, lines 3-19.

[40] *Ibid.*, chapter 49, p. 265, lines 23-31.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 266, lines 4-10.

Robert cannot find terms strong enough to condemn such a view: *Que quam falsa, quam nefanda, quam detestabilia sint nullum latere potest qui ratione uti valet, minus eum qui fidem cum ratione habet.*[42] Robert has no intention of discussing here the question of justice and the other virtues, e.g., is the charity, which is the merit of the just, God? His present concern is with the meaning of *est*. To get at that it is most advantageous to see whether words like "just" and "good" can bear degrees of comparison, even though applying to God and creatures with *diverse* meanings:

> Verum de significatione huius vocis 'est', in presenti agendum esse videtur, eo prius expedito quod interiectum est, id est, an hee voces 'iustus', 'bonus', 'misericors' et alie huiusmodi convenienter comparationis esse possint, licet Deo et electis in diversis significationibus conveniant.[43]

CHAPTER 50.

Were it true that diversity of meaning precluded comparison then practically all theological teaching, Catholic or otherwise, would be at an end. Denis the Areopagite's dictum that privations are truer of God than affirmations wouldn't hold if words like "just", "good", etc., were applied univocally. It is clear that no words apply with an identity of meaning: *unde manifestum est nullam omnino vocum Deo et creaturis in eadem convenire significatione.*[44] Rather, it is by a figure of speech that what is said properly of one thing is transferred to another, e.g., it is by such a figure that we say God is angry. In the same way we are said to be good and just, though these apply properly not to us, but to God. The reason for this is that true justice, true goodness is in God only. In us justice is not there truly; there is only a likeness in us of true justice: *Est namque in Deo vera iusticia, vera bonitas . . . ; in nobis non vere, sed verarum qualemcumque similitudinem habentes.*[45] At this point we may well suspect that Robert will find that true being pertains to God alone, and that creatures are not truly. But, before he comes to that, Robert has to show how similarity can permit comparison of things that are diverse in meaning. In doing so Robert arrives at a position very close to the doctrine of the analogy of proportionality. He was not able to apply it to *esse* in relation to essence for the simple reason, as we have seen, that *esse* means to be an essence.

The similarity alone, then, which we have to true justice permits one to say truly and correctly that God is more just than Paul. He insists that the comparison is possible not because of any participation in a common quality, but solely on the grounds of a similarity: *Hee namque comparationes ex similitudine rerum diversarum fiunt, et non ex communis qualitatis participatione.*[46] He uses the example of brightness: we can say that the brightness of God is greater than the brightness of the sun. Brightness cannot mean the same in both cases. Yet the comparison is not unjustified. Surely, then, God can be said to be more just than Paul, even though "just" is not used univocally. A similarity makes the attribution possible, but what similarity, when the things are diverse?

It is the similarity which things have from the viewpoint of their effects: it is the effects which are alike, even though they be in different genera: *Est quippe aliquorum similitudo ex suis effectibus in diversis rerum generibus, id est, ideo quia similia in diversis rerum effitiunt.*[47] The example of brightness is pat to his purpose. The sun's brightness so illumines the eyes of our body that we are enabled to see visible things about us. So, too, God's brightness illumines the eyes of the soul in such a way that we are enabled to behold the Light divine.

---

[42] *Ibid.*, lines 11-13.

[43] *Ibid.*, lines 17-22.

[44] *Ibid.*, chapter 50, p. 266, line 31-p. 267, line 12.

[45] *Ibid.*, lines 20-22.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 268, lines 15-17.

[47] *Ibid.*, lines 18-20.

There's no question of participation in a common form: the comparison is one of a proportional similarity of diverse effects. Robert does not use the term "proportional": he speaks of the comparison stemming from "their diverse effects in diverse genera". As the sun's brightness is to bodily vision, so is God's brightness to spiritual vision. Hence, Robert concludes: "every significance of things consists in those likenesses of things of diverse genera, which stem not from participation in a common quality, but are predicated because of the effects of what differ by nature. Hence it is neither false nor should it even seem false that the word '*est*' applies to God and creatures in a different sense."[48] The obvious question to ask here is: what effect is implied by *est* that enables one to establish a proportional similarity between God and creatures? Robert now turns his attention in the next four chapters to the meaning of *est*.

CHAPTER 51.

Robert starts by throwing bell, book and candle at those who with a "damnable audacity" say that *est* is used univocally of God and creatures: they do just this in their predicating the divine essence of creatures, which shows how insane they are. They say that, whenever *est* is used in apposition, it is the divine essence which is predicated:

> Quod tamen, quemadmodum dictum est, quidam dampnanda audatia asserere presumunt, id est, hoc verbum "est" in eadem significatione Deo convenire et rebus a Deo conditis; immo etiam id manifeste profitentur, quod eorum insaniam et falsitatis errorem evidentissime demonstrat, id est divinam essentiam de omni creatura enuntiari. Hac enim locutione: Paulus est, divinam essentiam de Paulo enuntiari mentiuntur. Quod etiam omni locutione fieri dogmatizant cuius hoc verbum "est" appositio est, id est, divinam essentiam de omni illo enuntiari de quo ea locutione agitur cuius hoc verbum "est" appositio est.[49]

The Faith, Scripture and all the philosophers join in condemning such an unheard of error. The philosophers have said not a little about the meaning *ens* or *est*. Some have thought there were diverse meanings. Others have thought there is but one meaning common to all things. But none have been so mad or shameless as to proclaim that the divine essence is to be predicated of everything.[50] Having delivered this broadside, Robert settles down in the next chapter to show why such predication is impossible. The discussion is valuable for the light it throws on the nature of God, on the meaning of *vere est*, and on the constitution of the creature.

CHAPTER 52.

Those, who say that God's essence is predicated of God and creatures, hold that God's essence is not God, but that by which God is:

> Nam si eam de omnibus creaturis enuntiari verum est, qua ratione verum erit Dei essentiam esse et creaturarum. Est enim Dei essentia, quemadmodum mentiuntur, non quia illa (269/270) Deus sit, sed quia ex illa Deus est. Unde et eadem ratione omnium creaturarum eam esse necesse est.[51]

The logical conclusion of this error is that, if the divine essence is truly enuntiated of creatures, then creatures must participate in it. It follows that the divine essence must be participated in either as form or subject of form:

---

[48] *Ibid.*, lines 26-30: Omnis vero rerum significatio in istis consistit similitudinibus rerum diversorum generum, que non est ex participatione communis qualitatis, sed quemadmodum dictum est ex effectibus rerum natura differentium.

[49] *Ibid.*, chapter 51, p. 269, lines 3-13.

[50] *Ibid.*, lines 14-26.

[51] *Ibid.*, chapter 52, p. 269, line 29-p. 270, line 2.

> Que namque erit causa quare ex illa Deum esse dicant, et non unamquamque creaturam, cum verum sit eam secundum eorum errorem de unaquaque creatura enuntiari. Si enim ea de unaquaque creatura vere enuntiatur, unaqueque creatura ea participat. Quia ergo unaqueque creatura ea participat, aut tanquam forma ea participat aut tanquam forme subiecto.[52]

In the remainder of the chapter Robert shows that the divine essence cannot be as the subject of either substantial or accidental form, for that would make it a matter, hence receptive of all forms and mutable. If resort is had to the subterfuge that the divine essence is like Plato's world-matter,[53] which is receptive of forms without possessing any, then the divine essence is simply the matter of the world.[54] In no way, then, can it be said that the divine essence is participated in as a subject of form. The following chapter will show why it cannot be participated in as a form common to creatures.

Of special interest in the above argument is, first, the insistence that the divine essence is immutable, invariable. Robert is going to equate *vere est* with impossibility of change or variation.[55] The second point of interest is the reason given for the divine essence, if participated in, having to be as form or subject of form. It is that there is nothing in the being of a creature which is not form or subject of form, although the creature is constituted from integral parts. These integral parts are, as it were, the matter of the whole and in the totality receive "information":

> Nichil enim in esse alicuius creature reperiri potest quod aliquod istorum non sit, quamvis et illa ex partibus integralibus habeat constitutionem. Partes namque integrales in ipso toto compositionis suscipiunt informationem. Siquidem ipsius tocius quodammodo materia sunt.[56]

Hence, though a creature be constituted of parts, *licet . . . ex partibus constet,* in its *esse* there is nothing that is not form or subject of form.

Robert does not give any examples of what he considers integral parts. Boethius in his *De Trinitate* speaks of body and soul as being the parts out of which man has his *esse*.[57] It would seem that Robert must mean material parts such as hands, feet, bones, blood, etc., which, if not "informed", are only an aggregate. But whatever Robert's meaning, it is clear that he here completely confirms his views of Chapter 46 that, for a creature, to be means to be an essence, a composed essence. There is no notion here of *esse* as act. And yet this does not in the least imply, for Robert, that *est* properly applies to a creature.

Chapter 53.

This chapter shows that the divine essence cannot be participated in by a creature as its form. Not as its substantial form, for as such it would have to be a quality: it would be to go against the whole weight of Catholic doctors and eminent philosophers to assert that there could be a substantial form which was not a quality.[58] Not as accidental form, for then the divine essence would be contingent (Robert says: *posset omnino non esse*). Nor as form, which was neither substantial nor accidental. This would be to countenance the fiction of a creature formed by a form that was neither substantial nor accidental: *Fingant ergo consequenter creaturam aliquam forma esse formatam que nec ei sit substantialis neque accidentalis.*[59]

---

[52] *Ibid.*, lines 2-8.

[53] Fr. Martin (*Sententie,* vol. 1, p. xx) writes: il emprunte des éléments de Physique au Timée de Platon dans la version de Chalcidius, à Macrobe et Guillaume de Conches. Il se rencontre avec Guillaume de Conches sur les points suivants: selon Platon Dieu a *créé* la matière, la volonté de Dieu est cause suprême, causalité universelle de Dieu, la bonté divine seul motif de la création, l'homme est le point central de la création.

[54] *Sententie,* vol. 2, p. 270, lines 2-32.

[55] *Ibid.*, chapter 59, p. 283, lines 3-4.

[56] *Ibid.*, chapter 52, p. 270, lines 8-13.

[57] Robert does not cite Boethius, but we can recognize the doctrine of the *De Trinitate,* PL 64, 1250; . . ut cum homo terrenus constet ex anima corporeque, corpus et anima est, non vel corpus vel anima in partem. . . .

[58] *Sententie,* vol. 2, chapter 53, p. 271, lines 1-12.

Even though such a creature is pure fiction, Robert, nevertheless, thinks it useful to take a look at a creature supposed to have been formed by participation in the divine essence. It cannot be a *quale, quantum* or anything that comes about through participation in any of the nine predicamental forms. It is something no creature can be, for it would have to be such as God is. As God would be formed by the form 'divine essence', so would the creature. Thus the creature would have an *esse* common with the creator:

> Cuiusmodi ergo formatum creatura esse potest ex participatione divine essentie, nullum sane nisi tale quale creatura esse non potest. Nam creatura talis esse non potest qualis Deus est. Quod falsum esse non potest si divina essentia forma creatoris et creature est. Quale namque formatum creator ex ea est, tale et creaturam ex eadem esse necesse est. Unde si divina essentia creatoris talis forma est ex qua est, et creature talis forma est ex qua et ipsa est. Habet ergo creature esse commune cum creatore.[60]

But this common *esse,* resulting from participation in the divine essence, is either mutable or immutable. If mutable, the creator is mutable. If immutable, then the creature is immutable. But it is "a detestable lie" that the creature is immutable, which it would have to be if every creature participates in the divine essence. Hence, the chapter concludes: "there can be no form which is said of God and creatures by this one word '*est*' ".[61]

CHAPTER 54.

Robert professes ignorance of what else *est* could mean if predicated in common of God and creatures. He will not impute views to his opponents which he is not certain they have proposed: that would look too much as though he were seeking an excuse to berate them rather than an occasion of refuting error through his love of truth. But he has no doubt that it is for reasons equally stupid someone would say that *esse* is common without being a form.[62]

Doesn't the presence of God in all things, it may be objected, show that there is an *est* which is common? Robert admits God is in all things, but not as matter, form or any other way existing in another that human mind can grasp. The predication of *est* cannot of itself show that God is in creatures, nor that it is said univocally of both. The reason is that *est* belongs properly to God, who alone properly is, just as He alone truly is. Creatures, on the other hand, just as they neither truly are, neither are they properly:

> Unde manifestum est Deum predicatione huius vocis "est" non posse ostendi creaturis inesse, nec eam Deo et creaturis in eadem significatione posse convenire. Nam Deo proprie convenit, qui solus proprie est, sicut et solus vere est. At creature sicuti nec vere sunt, ita nec proprie. Unde nec ista vox "est" eis proprie convenit, sed ex quadam ad illum qui vere est similitudine.[63]

---

[59] *Ibid.*, line 26. Robert enlarges on this Augustinian view of creation by formation in *Sententie*, vol. 1, p. 228f.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 272, lines 4-12

[61] *Ibid.*, lines 26-27.

[62] *Ibid.*, chapter 54, p. 272, line 30-p. 273, line 7: Quid vero aliud hoc esse possit quod de Deo et creaturis hac voce "est" communiter enuntietur ab eis non accepi. Et ideo (272/273) eis illud imponere nolo quod pro certo non habeo eos proposuisse, ne potius occasionem eos culpandi videar quesivisse quam amore veritatis eorum falsitatem repulisse. De hoc tamen non dubito qui eque magnis, immo etiam magis profanis falsitatum absurditatibus urgeatur quisquis aliud quam formam hac voce "est" dixerit significari, quod Deo et creaturis esse commune opinetur.

[63] *Ibid.*, lines 12-17.

So all proper predication of *est* of creatures is finally excluded. What predication there is must be because of some likeness (and not because of any participation).

In the following paragraph Robert shows how a similarity can justify the use of *est* for designating creatures. The word "man" is said of an individual man truly and properly, but not of a painting. You can say of a portrait "that's a man", not because of any true human substance there, but because of the likeness. In the same way *est* is said of creatures, not because there is any participation in true *esse*, but because of a likeness, a very slight likeness, one, in fact, which is weaker than in the case of the portrait:

> Quemadmodum ergo hec vox "homo" picture hominem representanti non ex veritate humane nature convenit, sed ex quadam similitudine, ita hec vox "est" non convenit creaturis ex veri esse participatione, sed ex illius tenuissima similitudine. Multo namque pictura homini similior est (273/274) quam creatura creatori. Et ideo ex viciniore similitudine picture ad hominem hec vox "homo" picture convenit quam sit illa similitudo creature ad creatorem, ex qua vox ista "est" creature convenire dicitur.[64]

Robert backs this up by an appeal to Scripture (*Romans* i, 20). There every creature is said to be an obscure likeness of God. So no believer should be upset at hearing that, if the *esse* of the creature be compared to eternal *esse*, the creature cannot be said to be truly.[65] This is why even the teachers of the Gentiles say that, in comparison with things unseen, sensible creatures only seem to be:

> Non debet mens fidelis turbari, si creature non dicantur vere esse, esse eorum ad eternum esse relato, cum et Gentium doctores hec sensibilia non dicant esse, sed videri esse, comparatione eorum que sensibus comprehendi non possunt. Multo quidem verius comparatione creatoris omnia creata possunt dici non esse, sed esse videri, eo quod creator vere est, cetera umbram et imaginem veri esse habent.[66]

So only the creator is truly, and all else has but a shadow or image of true *esse*.

Chapter 55.

Robert has come to the end of his discussion of the meaning of *est*. In chapter 55 he applies his findings to other seemingly common words, such as "spirit". Now it can be clearly seen that the reason, which, in an earlier chapter,[67] seemed to warrant an univocal attribution of "spirit" to God and man, is of little or no worth.[68] He concludes the chapter thus: "Therefore it is plain, from what has been said, that it is not necessary for the word '*est*' to apply univocally to Creator and creature, although it is well and truly said that Creator and creature are."[69] In other words, it is true to say (*vere dicitur*) that the Creator is (and this means *truly is*) and the creature is (and this means seems to be truly, is not truly, is but an image of *vere esse*).

Chapters 56-59.

In the remaining four chapters of part 5 Robert comes back to the problem posed in chapter 45. He is now able definitively to show why the eternally true

---

[64] *Ibid.*, line 27 - p. 274, line 4.

[65] Note the equivalence of the eternal with the immutable: to be truly is to be always, immutably what one is.

[66] *Sententie*, vol. 2, p. 274, lines 7-15. Robert could have read this Platonic view of creatures in an author whom he frequently cites, *scil.* St. Jerome. Cf. Jerome, *Epist. XVI ad Damasum* (PL 22, 357): Una est Dei et sola natura, quae vere est. Id enim quod subsistit, non habet aliunde, sed suum est. Cetera quae creata sunt, etiamsi videntur esse, non sunt: quia aliquando non fuerunt; et potest rursum non esse, quod non fuit. Deus solus qui eternus est, hoc est, qui exordium non habet, essentiae nomen vere tenet.

[67] *Ibid.*, chapter 47.

[68] *Ibid.*, chapter 55, p. 275.

[69] *Ibid.*, lines 5-8: Ex hoc ergo perspicuum

(*verum*) does not postulate the eternal existence of anything other than God. In a deeper analysis he shows that "true" and "truth" belong properly to the utterance of a true enuntiation. They are said of things only by transference from this primary instance: thus, because a prophecy is true, the prophet himself can be called a true prophet. This means that *verum* and *veritas* are not in the realm of things. Otherwise there could not be a multiplicity of such *vera* when there is nothing existing at all: *multa namque huiusmodi vera nullis rebus existentibus esse possibile est.*[70] So *verum* cannot designate any *thing* which would be neither the Creator nor a creature. Even had it been true, by an impossible supposition, that God had not been from all eternity, that truth would not have entailed there being any *thing* non-divine from all eternity.[71] Even Aristotle[72] is a witness to the exclusion of *verum* from the circle of things: he says that truth and falsity are a matter of composition and division in the intellect.[73] This confirms the conclusion that *verum* has nothing to do with positing or not positing things: *nichil esse oportere, quod aliqua rerum sit vel aliqua non sit, quia verum est.*[74]

It follows that "still less is it necessary that there be any thing which is God or is not God, because of truth."[75] The contrary would entail ludicrous consequences for the doctrine of the Trinity. After detailing such consequences, Robert repeats, as thoroughly proved, his contention that *nec vera nec veritates que locutionibus enuntiativis designantur aliqua esse que nec creator nec creature sint.*[76]

A final difficulty arises from trinitarian doctrine: the Father is said to be *verax*, the Son *veritas*, and the Holy Ghost neither. Yet the appellation "truth" is common to all Three. We need not follow Robert's discussion in detail. What is to our purpose is that Robert is helped by St. Paul to see why the word "true" is used to signify God. St. Paul says that God is called truth because He is invariable both in His essence and in His promises. It is the impossibility of variation which makes God "truly true":

> Ait enim ideo Deum veritatem dici quod invariabilis est tam in essentia quam in promissione. Quod est eum verum esse et veritatem. Ipse enim vere verus est et vere veritas est, quia eum variationem aliquam admittere impossibile est.[77]

---

est, quia hanc vocem "est" non est necesse in eadem significatione convenire creatori et creaturis, quamquam vere et convenienter dicatur: creator et creatura sunt.

[70] *Ibid.*, chapter 56, pp. 276-277.

[71] *Ibid.*, chapter 57, p. 278.

[72] Robert has two quotations from Aristotle: (1) Ait enim Aristotiles in libro *Interpretationum circa compositionem et divisionem esse veritatem et falsitatem*, and (2) Hoc idem etiam in libro *De anima* evidentius determinat, dicens *complexionem intellectuum esse veritatem ac falsitatem*. The editor correctly gives the source of the first quotations as Boethius, *In librum de interpretatione, editie altera*; PL 64, 414D. For the second he cites what he considers the relevant passage in Aristotle's *De Anima* III, 6: In quibus autem et falsum iam et verum est, compositio quaedam iam intellectuum est, sicut eorum quae unum fiunt. This, according to the Bekker pagination, would be 430*a*27. The strictly relevant passage, however, is III, 8, 432*a*11: complexio enim intellectuum est verum aut falsum. Lest this reference to the *De Anima* be taken as evidence that Robert was using an early medieval translation, it should be noted that his source is again Boethius, *op. cit.*, PL 64, 406C: Sed haec in libris de Anima verissime diligentissimeque separavit dicens: (here follows the Greek text of Aristotle's *De Anima* III, 8, 432*a*10-14, then the Latin translation) . . . Est autem imaginatio diversa ab affirmatione et negatione, complexio namque intellectuum est veritas vel falsitas, etc. Though the first Latin translation of the *De Anima* was made perhaps shortly after the middle of the twelfth century (cf. G. Lacombe, *Aristoteles Latinus*, Pars Prior, Rome, 1939, p. 58), the *terminus ad quem* (1160) of Robert's *Sentences* make it hardly likely that he saw it. The present lone citation and the evident similarity of wording to Boethius' translation make it certain that Robert was making no use of Aristotle himself. The mention of Aristotle, therefore, in the table of *Citations d'Auteurs Profanes* (p. 393) should be omitted.

[73] *Sententie*, vol. 2, part 5, chapter 57, p. 278, line 17 - p. 279, line 3.

[74] *Ibid.*, chapter 23.

[75] *Ibid.*, chapter 58, p. 279, line 26: Multo ergo minus necessarium est aliquid esse quod Deus sit vel quod Deus non sit, quia verum est.

[76] *Ibid.*, p. 281, lines 16-18. Cf. *Romans* iii. 4.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 283, lines 1-3.

CONCLUSION.

In the chapters analyzed we have enough, I think, to give us a clear and consistent picture of Robert's understanding of *est*. As used of God it means to be truly, for He alone truly is, properly is, because He alone is simple, unchangeable, not composed of parts, not having His *esse ex aliquibus*, not formed by any form, identical with His essence, of Whom all predicates *ex ipso* are predicated by identity and essentially and not by participation in any form that is not God, Who, therefore, has nothing in common with His creatures. *Est* is said of God truly and properly. *Essentia* or *ens* or *esse*, which are all the same, are properly said of God alone. For God to be is to be immutably, eternally, simply what He is.

Creatures exist, but are not truly. It can be said truly that they are, but their 'to be' is not a true 'to be', but only an image, a faint likeness of the divine 'to be', of true *esse*. Creatures are not truly, because they are the unstable union of form and subject of form. To be for them is to be *ex aliquibus*. It is to be a mutable, contingent union of form and matter which is a plurality of integral parts.

Robert's world is that of Boethius and St. Augustine. Creatures exist, but what is noticed is not their existence but their status as images of the immutable.

There is much here of value for anyone interested in the development of mediaeval thought before the impact of Aristotelian metaphysics. Robert had an idea of proportional analogy, but never thought of applying it to *esse*, since he had not arrived at the notion of *esse* as an act distinct from essence. The application which he did make to the data at hand seems to have solved the problem for him. He is content to hold that one can *truly say* that a creature is, but not that it *is truly*. But this left a deeper problem: if the being of a creature is not to be truly, is it a creature at all in the tenuousness of its shadow-consistency?

Mediaevalia

I. The Round Table and the Council of Rheims, 1049.

THE first mention of the Round Table and its institution was made by Wace in his *Gestes des Bretons* or *Brut* about the year 1155. There it is stated that Arthur's purpose in constructing the Round Table was to prevent quarrels among his proud and famed knights concerning precedence:

> Pur les nobles baruns qu'il out,
> Dunt chescuns mieldre estre quidout,
> Chescuns se teneit al meillur,
> Ne nuls n'en saveit le peiur,
> Fist Artur la Roünde Table
> Dunt Bretons dient mainte fable.
> Illuec seeient li vassal
> Tuit chevalment e tuit egal;
> A la table egalment seeient
> E egalment servi esteient;
> Nul d'els ne se poeit vanter
> Qu'il seïst plus halt de sun per,
> Tuit esteient assis meiain,
> Ne n'i aveit nul de forain.[1]

Writing some fifty years later, Layamon makes specific reference to the quarrel and bloodshed occasioned by pride and emulation that preceded the institution of the Round Table.[2] At a Yuletide feast in London, seven kings' sons had been present with seven hundred knights. When the banquet was served, they began to quarrel about precedence.[3] Words passed to blows until finally the son of Rumareth of Winetland, there as a hostage, advised Arthur to arm his native knights. Meanwhile he himself seized three knives and killed seven men including the knight who had begun the disturbance. At this, bloodshed became general until Arthur returned with his knights, quelled the tumult, punished those who were the cause of it, swore an oath and caused those present to swear that never would such a scene recur. Layamon goes on to say that a tale tells how Arthur went to Cornwall and that there a carpenter came to him and boasted of his craftsmanship. He had heard of the fight and of its cause. He would make a table whereat sixteen hundred or more knights might sit in perfect equality so that none might be considered to sit at the head or at the foot of the table.[4] Arthur might carry such a table with him wherever he went and therefore need not be afraid of a recurrence of the quarrel.[5] In four weeks the table was completed. Arthur called his knights to table and when they were seated and at meat, each spoke with the other as if to a brother. Each knight was exceedingly well disposed, all were on an equal footing, none could boast that he was served differently or more slowly than his peer.[6]

---

[1] Arthur made the Round Table, concerning which Bretons tell many a tale, for his noble barons, each of whom considered himself better (than the other). Each one looked upon himself as the best, and none admitted himself to be the worse. There sat his vassals all in knightly fashion and all in equality; they sat at table in equal wise and were served equally. None of them could boast that he sat at a place higher than his peer. All were seated next to each other and there was no one who was at the exterior position. *Li Romans de Brut de Wace* 9747-9760. Ed. Ivor Arnold II, (Paris, 1940), pp. 513-4.

[2] *Layamon's Brut*, 22736 ff. Ed. Sir Frederic Madden II (London, 1847).

[3] Aelc hafede an heorte
leches heȝe,
and lette þat he weore
bettere þan his ivere;
þat folc wes of feole londe
þer wes muchel onde,
for þe an hine talde haeh
þe oðer muche herre. *Ibid.*, 22751-8.

[4] Ah ich þe wulle wurche
a weorc swiþe hende,
þat þer maȝen sitten to
sixtene hundred and ma,
al turn abuten
þat nan ne beon wið uten;
wið uten and wið inne,
mon toȝenes monne. *Ibid.*, 22913-20.

In the two accounts, one an outgrowth of the other, the Round Table was made by Arthur or for Arthur to prevent quarrels arising among his knights on the question of precedence or to prevent a recurrence of such a quarrel. The Round Table was designed to equalize the knights, thereby moderating their pride and desire of emulation. At such a table, each knight would be *meiain, wið inne*, that is between two comrades who, each in his turn, would be *medi-anus*. No one would be *forain, wið uten*, that is at the exterior or end position of the table.

In 1049, over a hundred years before Wace's account of the institution of the Round Table, Pope Leo IX used the same device at the Council of Rheims to prevent a quarrel over precedence between the clergies of the Archbishops of Treves and Rheims.

Before his election to the papacy and while still Bishop of Toul, Pope Leo had promised Hérimar, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Remi at Rheims, that he would make a pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Remi. A few months after his assumption of Peter's throne and while in Germany, Hérimar recalled to the Pope the promise that he had made and entreated him to consecrate at the same time the new basilica that had been erected. Pope Leo assented and seized upon the occasion to plan a Council to be held at Rheims of the French King and hierarchy with a view of reforming the Church and righting the abuses rampant at the time among clergy and laity.[7] King Henry I of France sent his regrets that he would be unable to attend the Council with his prelates, regrets occasioned by the suggestion of certain prelates that in attending the Council under the jurisdiction of the Pope the royal prestige might thereby suffer. The King proposed that the Council be postponed until a more propitious time. The Pope replied that his promise to consecrate the Church of St. Remi would be religiously kept and that he would be at Rheims on the day fixed to hold the Council with those friends of religion who would be assembled there. Certain bishops and abbots left with the king on a military expedition against 'rebelles'. A group of others, possibly under royal influence or in fear of the consequences of reform, sent their written regrets. Still others obeyed the Pope's command.[8] The Archbishop of Rheims was the sole archbishop, properly speaking, of France to attend since Treves, Lyons and Besançon lay in Germany and Burgundy reunited in a single kingdom by Conrad II.

On the 29th of September, 1049, therefore, Pope Leo IX left Toul, his former episcopal see, accompanied by an entourage of civil and ecclesiastical dignitaries from France, Germany, Burgundy and Italy. He was received by Guy, Archbishop of Rheims, and celebrated Mass at the Cathedral. On October 1st, the Feast of St. Remi, the relics of the saint were translated with solemn ceremony from his tomb at the Monastery of St. Remi to the Cathedral and there placed on the altar of the Holy Cross. Meanwhile the Archbishop of Treves had consecrated the oratory of the Holy Trinity in the Church of St. Remi. The following day, October 2nd, the body of St. Remi was borne about the city. During the procession the Pope consecrated the new church and the relics of St. Remi were left exposed on the main altar in order that during the Council they might be seen by all and might be an inspiration to well-doing. The Pope then said Mass, preached a sermon and imparted the Papal benediction. At the same time, he invited the bishops and abbots to be present the next day in the new church to celebrate the Council.

---

[5] and ne dert þu navere adrede;
to þere worlde longen,
þaet aevere aeni modi cniht
at þine borde makie fiht;
for þer scal þe hehze
beon aefne þan loȝe. *Ibid.*, 22924-9.

[6] þo alle weoren iseten
cnihtes to heore mete,
þa spaec aelc wið oðer
alse hit weore his broðer.
alle heo seten abuten,
nes þer nan wið uten.
Aeverealches cunnes cniht,
þere wes swiðe wel idiht.
alle heo weoren bi ane,
þe hehȝe and þa laȝe.
ne mihten þer nan ȝelpen
for oðere kunnes scencken
oðer his iveren
þe at þan beorde weoren. *Ibid.*, 22939-52.

[7] A detailed description of the background of the Council, the dedication of the Church of St. Remi, the preliminaries of the Council and the enactments of the Council itself is given by Anselm, a monk of St. Remi and an eyewitness to the events. This description was written at the demand of Hérimar, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Remi. *Historia Dedicationis ecclesiae s. Remigii apud Remos auctore Anselmo ejusdem loci monacho et aequali*; PL 142, 1411-40.

[8] Cf. Augustin Fliche, *La Reforme grégorienne* I (Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, 6, Louvain, 1924), pp. 136-7.

On the 3rd of October, 1049, twenty bishops, about fifty abbots and a great multitude of clergy responded to the appeal. Present also were ambassadors of Edward of England come to bring to His Holiness their monarch's oath of fidelity. Scarcely had the capitulants entered the Church when the old dispute between the clergy of the Archbishop of Rheims and that of the Archbishop of Treves broke out anew.[9] Those of Rheims claimed that their Archbishop was

[9] For the historical background, political and ecclesiastical, to the dispute, for the relationship between Rheims and Treves, for the controversy itself, cf. Herman Schmidt, 'Trier und Reims in ihrer verfassungsrechtlichen Entwicklung bis zum Primatialstreit des neunten Jahrnunderts', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 49 (1929), kanonistiche Abteilung XVIII, 1-111, especially section VI, 'Der Streit zwischen Thietgaud von Trier und Hinkmar von Reims um den Primat in der Provinz Belgica und die Beziehungen zwischen Trier und Reims bis zum Jahre 869', 77-107.

Apparently, on the occasion of the Council, the quarrel between Treves and Rheims concerning the title of Primate of the Province of Belgium, dormant since the ninth century (Schmidt, *art. cit.*, p. 109), had broken out afresh. It was a quarrel of precedence and jurisdiction that had come to the fore in the struggle between Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and Thietgaud, Archbishop of Treves. It stretched back to the very founding of the Churches and had its ultimate roots in the political and ecclesiastical division of the old Roman provinces of the Western Empire. What had been Gallia Belgica had been divided into four new provinces, two Germanias close to the Rhine, and two Belgicas called Belgica Prima and Belgica Secunda. Basically it was because Treves was the capital city of Belgica Prima that it claimed precedence over Rheims. It was of course a claim inacceptable to the latter. On the contrary, when occasion arose, the Archbishops of Rheims defended their right based on papal authority to the Primacy of Gallia Belgica. Cf. Guillaume Marlot, *Histoire de la ville, cité et université de Reims* I, xxxiii-iv (Reims, 1843), pp. 171-9; especially II, v: 'Que l'église de Reims n'a jamais relevé du primat de Treves, ny d'aucun autre qui soit en France avec la response aux objections qu'on luy oppose', vol. I, pp. 203-8.

The champion of the Primacy of the Archbishops of Rheims was Hincmar. He based their claim on the Bull sent to Saint Remi by Pope Hormisdas: Attamen, velis nolis, sanctus Hormisda papa tibi ostendet primatem esse hujus provinciae illum qui in sede beati Remigii apud Rhemorum metropolim est ordinatus episcopus (*Opuscula et epistolae qui spectant in causam Hincmari Laudunensis;* PL 126, 338). After quoting the Bull in full, Hincmar strengthens his case by referring to ancient privileges confirmed by Pope Hadrian I to Tilpin his predecessor, that he be recognized as Primate of the Province with authority over the cities formerly dependent on his jurisdiction and that he be not subject to any power except that of the Holy See: Sed et Adrianus papa Tilpino praedecessori nostro talia suae auctoritatis privilegia, et sibi commissae Ecclesiae dedit (*op. cit.;* PL 126, 339). Moreover Hincmar asserted that claim of supremacy in a letter against Thieutgaud Archbishop of Treves who had claimed the title of Primas Belgicae Primae (Cf. Mansi, *Concilia* XV, 645): Teutgaudio Treverensi de primatu quem deferri ab eo debere scripserat ille sedi Treverorum, insinuans id eidem sedi a sede Remorum nunquam fuisse delatum (*Flodoardi historia Remensis ecclesiae* III, 21; ed. M. Lejeune II [Reims, 1854], p. 206). Furthermore in a letter to Pope Leo IV, as reported by Flodoard, Hincmar recalls to the Holy Father the antiquity of the privileges extended to Rheims from the very time when privileges were conceded to episcopal sees, that the Archbishop of Rheims has always had first rank among primates as one of the most ancient primates of Gaul and that he has none above him except the Pontiff, successor to the Apostles. He asks him to confirm and to amplify such privileges: Item in eodem de privilegiis hujus Remensis ecclesiae, quae habuit ab initio, quo privilegia sedes habere coeperunt; et quia Remorum episcopus primas inter primatas semper, et unus de primis Galliae primatibus exstitit, nec alium se potiorem, praeter apostolicum praesulem, habuit: ut scilicet ea, quae tanto tempore ab antecessoribus ipsius huic sedi sunt concessa et conservata, conservare et augmentare digne-

Primate of Gaul and as such had the right to arrange the seating plan of the Synod. Those of Treves, on the other hand, maintained that that dignity belonged to their Archbishop and that he ought to have the first place in the Council after the Pontiff of the Roman Church. The Pope did not think it opportune at that particular moment to put an end to the dispute and feared rather that a controversy of this kind might end in contention and become a cause of scandal. He proposed therefore that the thrones of the bishops be arranged in the form of a crown or circle and that his own throne be placed in the centre. He determined further that such an arrangement be carried out under the direction of the Archbishop of Rheims. The latter then called his archdeacons and some of the more prominent of his clergy and conformable to the Pope's order arranged the episcopal thrones in the form of a circle and placed in the midst of them the insignia of the Apostolic throne.[10]

---

tur (*op. cit.*, III, 10; *ed. cit.*, II, pp. 44-5).

Fulco, Archbishop of Rheims and successor to Hincmar, writing to Stephen V in 885 derives the primacy of Rheims from the mission of its first bishop Saint Sixtus by Saint Peter who gave him the primacy of all Gaul as well as the appointment of St. Remi by Pope Hormisdas as his vicegerent: Uti condecet Rhemensem, quem antecessores vestri, prae omnibus Gallicanis pensi habentes, primatu donarunt in Sixto Primo totius regionis praesule a beato Petro apostolorum principe huc destinato, etiam Hormisdas papa Remigium per omnem Galliam vices suas obire voluit (*Fulconis archiepiscopi Rhemensis epistolae. Epistola prima ad Stephanum Pontificem Maximum;* PL 131, 13. Cf. also an analysis of the letter made by Flodoard: sedem vero Remensem notum habeat ab antecessoribus suis potius Gallicanis omnibus Ecclesiis semper fuisse honoratum; utpote quum primas apostolorum beatus Petrus primum destinaverit huic urbi sanctum Sixtum, et totius Gallicanae regionis dederit ei primatum; Hormisda quoque papa sancto Remigio vices suas in Galliarum partibus commiserit (*op. cit.* IV, I; *ed. cit.*, II, p. 413).

Thus, although Treves at the time of the Empire had been the seat of the Prefect of Gaul and although its archbishop was the metropolitan of Belgica Prima and for those reasons laid claim to Primacy, Rheims never conceded it to her. Indeed it was felt that from the time of their institution, there was an equality between them, an equality based on ecclesiastical authority and ancient custom and that precedence of their respective metropolitans arose not from the dignity of the locale but from the date of consecration: Inter quas, Rhemensem scilicet et Trevirensem ecclesiam (hae enim duas tantum provincias Belgica regio habet), haec semper distinctio fuit, sicut in ecclesiasticis monumentis invenimus, et vetustissimam consuetudinem semper obtinuisse comperimus, ut isdem episcopus non loci, sed dignitate ordinis prior secundum sacras regulas haberetur, qui foret in qualibet istarum Ecclesiarum metropoli antea ordinatus (*Hincmari epistola ad Nicolaum papam;* PL 126, 40). It was probably to prevent jealousy and such quarrels as eventually did arise that five years later, on the occasion of a sermon preached at Metz in 869 at the crowning of Charles the Bald, Hincmar repeated the same thing and referred to the Churches of Rheims and Treves as sister and coprovincial churches: . . . Rhemensis et Trevirensis Ecclesiae in hac regione Belgica, cum sibi commissis ecclesiis, sorores et comprovinciales habentur, sicut auctoritas ecclesiastica et antiquissima demonstrat consuetudo; ac per hoc unanimi consensu et synodolici judicia exercere, et quae a sanctis Patribus constituta sunt, debent concorditer custodire, hac privilegii conditione servata, ut qui prior de Rhemensi et Trevirensi episcopis fuerit ordinatus, prior etiam habeatur (*Annuntiatio Hincmari archiepiscopi in ecclesia Sancti Stephani* I; PL 125, 805).

The proximate occasion of the contention at the Council of Rheims was likely the result of Pope Leo IX's action at the Council of Rome. There in the preceding April, the Pope had renewed to Eberhardt, Archbishop of Treves, the privilege of primacy over all Gallia Belgica. On Passion Sunday, March 12, he had invested him with the primacy by imposing on him the Roman mitre in St. Peter's and by pledging him to organize henceforth divine service in his diocese conformable to Roman usage. In the Council the Pope with universal consent had confirmed the privileges bestowed in ancient times on the Church of Treves: the Archbishop always had the right to the first place after the papal legate; in the absence of the latter, he was to take his seat immediately after the King. Cf. Mansi, *Concilia* XIX, 723 and Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* IV² (Paris, 1911), p. 1008.

[10] Die vero altera, quae est quinto Nonas Octobris, congregati sunt in memorata basilica episcopi videlicet numero viginti, cum quinquaginta fere abbatibus, et aliis ecclesiastici ordinis compluris. Ubi statim vetus querela inter Remensis et Trevirensis archiepiscopi clericos est renovata; his astruentibus quia Remensis primas esset in Gallia, ideoque illi dispositio competeret synodica; e contra vero illi archiepiscopo Trevirensi eamdem dignitatem conabantur ascribere, primamque sedem post Romanae Ecclesiae praesulem in celebrando concilio acquirere. Domnus autem papa non arbitratus oportunum tempus quo his rationibus imponi valeret congruens finis, sed potius metuens hujusmodi controversiam prorumpere ad scandalum contentionis, in modum coronae sedilia episcoporum disponi, et in medio eorum suae sedis suggestum praecepit locari,

After the opening prayer, all took their seats in the order fixed by the Archbishop of Rheims. The Pope sat in the midst of the choir facing west towards the tomb of St. Remi. Facing him and a bit to the right was Guy Archbishop of Rheims and a little to the left Eberhardt Archbishop of Treves. Next to the Archbishop of Rheims sat Berthold Bishop of Soissons, then Drogo Bishop of Térouanne, then Frollard Bishop of Senlis, then Adalberon Bishop of Metz. South of the latter was Aylenard Archbishop of Lyons, then Hugh Bishop of Langres, then Josfrid Bishop of Coutances, then Ivo Bishop of Séez, then Herbert Bishop of Lisieux. Beginning the left segment of the circle and in a northerly direction sat Hugh Bishop of Bayeux, then Hugh Bishop of Avranches, then Thierry Bishop of Verdun. North of the latter was placed Hugh Archbishop of Besançon, then Hugh Bishop of Nevers, then Eusebius Bishop of Angers, then Pudicus Bishop of Nantes, then Duduc the English Bishop of Wells, then finally John Bishop of Porto.

Behind these bishops and again in the form of a circle sat the abbots of various monasteries to the number of fifty. Among these were Hérimar of St. Remi, Hugh of Cluny, Foulques of Corbie, Robert of Prüm, Geoffrey of Vézelay, Wilfric of St. Augustines in Canterbury, Alwin of St. Benedicts in England, etc.[11]

It is true that the seating arrangement at the Council of Rheims in 1049 was not about an actual table nor was there question of festive eating and drinking as there is in the institution of the Round Table. Rather at the Council, there was question of arranging the episcopal thrones in circular form from which the hierarchy might discuss as equals the matters brought up at the Council. There is this, however, that the Council of Rheims and Arthur's Round Table have in common: a seating arrangement to prevent or at least to put a stop to contention over precedence. As in the institution of the Round Table where Arthur's purpose was to prevent contention concerning precedence by preserving equality among his knights so that none could claim a more honorable position than his fellow, so at the Council of Rheims Pope Leo IX determined on a circular arrangement of episcopal thrones to put a stop to contention concerning precedence of one archbishop over the other. It is the circular seating arrangement, not the table itself, that they have in common together with the purpose of that arrangement: the prevention of quarrels concerning precedence.

Both Wace and Layamon assert that tales concerning the Round Table were current among the Bretons.[12] It is generally conceded that Layamon's story of

---

cujus ordinationis modum ex arbitrio Remensis archipraesulis sanxit administrari; qui convocatis archidiaconis, et quibusque cleri sui praecipuis, cum eorum consilio, in modum, ut dictum est, coronae, pontificum sedilia, et in medio ejus apostolicae sedis apparari fecit insignia. PL 142, 1430. Also in Joannes Dominicus Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* XIX (9 ed. Venice, 1774), 736.

[11] Post haec consederunt omnes, ordine quo Remensis archipraesul disposuit, domnus quidem papa in medio, ut dictum est, chori, verso vultu ad sepuchrum beati Remigii, ante oculos autem ejus, ad orientalem plagam, (Wido) Remensis in dextera, (Eberhardus) Trevirensis vero in parte resedit sinistra. Post Remensem deinde secundum subnotatum ordinem resederunt Beroldus Suessionensis, Drogo Morinensis, Rollandus (*al.* Frollandus) Silvanectensis, Adalbero Metensis; ad meridionalem plagam, Aylenardus archiepiscopus Lugdunensis, Hugo Lingonensis, Joffridus Constantiensis, Ivo Sagensis, Herbertus Lisoiensis, Hugo Bajogacensis, Hugo Avringensis, Theodericus Virdunensis; ad septentrionalem vero plagam, Hugo archiepiscopus Vesontionensis, Hugo Nivernensis, Eusebius Andegavensis, Pudicus Nannetensis, episcopus Anglorum, et Johannes Portuensis. Post quorum terga in modum similiter coronae resederunt abbates hoc ordine: domnus scilicet abbas sancti Remigii Herimarus, domnus Hugo Cluniacensis . . . Folco Corbiensis, Robertus Prumiensis . . . Godfridus Verzelliacensis . . . Wilfricus sancti Augustini Cantuariensis, Alwinus sancti Benedicti de terra Anglorum; deinde ceteri, qui, ut superius relatum est, simul furerunt numero fere quinquaginta. PL 142, 1430-1; Mansi, *Concilia* XIX, 737.

Dom Leclercq has reconstructed graphically the scheme of the seating arrangement at this Council. *Histoire des Conciles* IV^{2} (Paris, 1911), p. 1018, n. 1.

[12] *Li Romans de Brut de Wace*, 9752: Dunt

the institution of the Round Table derives from Celtic tales.[13] Stories concerning quarrels over precedence, based on the motif of the Champion's Portion, are of frequent occurrence in Celtic tradition[14] and are exemplified in Irish literature by the *Fled Bricend* and the *Scel Mucci mac Datho*.[15] It is commonly acknowledged, too, that Celtic elements underlie the concept of Arthur's table.[16] Posidonius describes a circular seating arrangement among the early Celts[17] and in the *Fled Bricend* we are told that in the house that Bricriu caused to be built for King Conchobar and his Ultonians 'in the foremost of the palace a royal couch was erected for Conchobar high above those of the whole house . . . Around it were placed the twelve couches of the twelve heroes of Ulster.'[18] It may well have been good common-sense that prompted Pope Leo IX to devise the stratagem to put a stop to the conflict of two rival Archbishops for precedence at the Council of Rheims. On the other hand, there is every chance that it was suggested to his mind by stories current among the Celts of a circular seating arrangement in a banquet hall as exemplified in the *Fled Bricend* and by another motif of Celtic tradition, the Champion's Portion.

There is no evidence of specific Celtic contacts in Wibert of Toul's biography of Leo IX. On the other hand, Bruno Dagsbourg, born in Egisheim in Alsace in 1002, was educated as a boy and as a cleric at the Cathedral School of St. Stephen's at Toul. At the age of twenty-four he was elected bishop of the diocese of Toul and ruled for more than twenty years (1026-48) before his election to the Papacy at the Diet of Worms in 1048.[19] The diocese of Toul was contiguous to centres of Irish learning and studies such as Rheims and Laon and lay in country in which Celtic influence had been strong from the seventh century on.[20] The city of Toul was situated just to the north of the great influential monasteries founded by St. Columbanus: Annégray, Fontaine and Luxeuil. In the tenth century Adso of Moutier-en-Der was able to write of the latter: 'And

---

Bretons dient mainte fable.

Layamon's Brut:
þis was þat ilke bord
þat Bruttes of ȝelpeþ,
and seggeþ feole cunne laesinge. 22953-5.

[13] Cf. R. S. Loomis, *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes* (New York, 1949), pp. 61-7. Cf. also J. D. Bruce, *The Evolution of Arthurian Romance* I (Baltimore, 1928), p. 87: there is hardly room for doubt that Arthur's Round Table belongs to the paraphernalia which attached itself to him in Celtic tradition . . . The Irish parallels, moreover, render it probable that the conception obtained, also, among the insular Celts, as we know from Wace that it did among the Britons.

[14] Cf. Jean Marx, *Le légende arthurienne et le graal* (Paris, 1952), pp. 97-8, and A.C.L. Brown, 'The Round Table Before Wace', *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* VII (1900): it appears then from sources so widely separated as classical antiquity and Irish saga, that a tendency to quarrel about precedence at feasts was a universal Celtic failing, and that the use of a round table, presumably to obviate these disputes, was widely known and probably also Pan Celtic, p. 197.

[15] *Fled Bricend*, ed. and tr. George Henderson (London, 1899): *An Early Irish Reader*, N. K. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1927). Cf. the latter, *Introduction* pp. 6-8, for a review of the Celtic motif of the Champion's Portion.

[16] Cf. Lewis F. Mott, 'The Round Table', *PMLA* 20 (1905), pp. 238 ff.

[17] The Celtae placed food before their guests, putting grass for their seats, and they serve it upon wooden tables raised a very little above the ground . . . But when many of them sup together, they all sit in a circle; and the bravest sits in the middle, like the coryphaeus of a chorus; because he is superior to the rest either in his military skill, or in birth, or in riches; and then on each side the rest of the guests sit in regular order, according as each is eminent or distinguished for anything. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophito* IV, 36; tr. C. D. Yonge I (London, 1854), p. 245. Cf. Carl Müller, *Fragmenta* III (Paris, 1849), p. 259.

[18] *Fled Bricend*, ed. and tr. George Henderson, pp. 3, 5.

[19] *Sancti Leonis vita auctore Wiberto;* PL 143, 466-84. Guibert was an archdeacon of Toul and a contemporary of Leo IX. He began his biography while the Pope was still alive in 1054. Book I contains an account of the birth, youth and education of Bruno, his election to the episcopacy of Toul in 1026 and his work until his election to the papacy in 1048 at the Assembly of Worms. Book II relates the events of Bruno's life as Leo IX and was composed after the Pope's death. It is considered an authentic and veracious biography and is the source of later biographies, such as Eugène Martin, *Saint Léon IX* (Paris, 1904) and Odon Delarc, *Un pape alsacien* (Paris, 1876).

[20] Cf. Louis Gougaud, *Christianity in Celtic Lands* (London, 1932), p. 302 ff.; James F. Kenney, *Sources for the Early History of Ireland* (New York, 1929), pp. 569-94, p. 605 ff.

now what place, what city does not rejoice in having for its ruler a bishop or an abbot trained in the discipline of that cloister? For it is certain that by virtue of its authority almost the whole of the land of the Franks has been for the first time properly furnished with regular institutions'.[21] Almost during the lifetime of the Alsatian Pope we know that Adalbero II, Bishop of Metz (984-1005), held in high regard the Irish and other holy pilgrims that assembled at his episcopal city.[22] His biographer relates that Adalbero entrusted the restoration of the monastery of St. Symphorian to an Irishman Fingen, abbot of St. Clement in Metz,[23] and that Fingen after the restoration of the monastery won it for Celtic influence.[24]

It is indeed quite likely that Bruno had opportunities for contacts with the Irish in his own city of Toul, where he spent more than thirty years. Less than twenty years before he was sent to school there by his parents, Toul had been a centre of hospitality for Irish clerics and pilgrims. On the authority of Abbot Widric of Toul, the biographer of St. Gerard, Bishop of Toul (963-994), we know that the saintly bishop had sheltered and entertained such exiles and wayfarers.[25] Widric relates how these clerics assembled at different altars in the chapel where they offered prayers of supplication and praise to God after the manner of their homeland: *more patrio*.[26] The biographer's story of the Irish cleric's presentiment of the saint's death, his warning and its fulfilment testifies to the high regard in which St. Gerard was held by the Irish that he maintained there.[27] Thus, it is not impossible that Pope Leo IX as a boy, as a cleric, as bishop of Toul knew the story of the Round Table current among the Celts from Irish clerics of the locality or from the Irish *peregrini* with whom he came into contact. If he did, then it is not surprising that he adapted the story to his own needs when faced, at the Council of Rheims, with a problem such as Arthur had faced and resolved: contention over precedence.

A. J. Denomy C.S.B.
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

II. *Sub Umbris Arborum.*

Le très regretté Dom Wilmart a restitué à saint Bernard une lettre, où l'abbé de Clairvaux enjoint à Aelred de Rievaulx de composer un traité sur la charité.[1] Cette lettre répond manifestement à une autre, où Aelred, ayant déjà reçu la même injonction, s'était excusé sur son manque de culture littéraire de la tâche que Bernard voulait lui imposer. Le texte de l'abbé de Clairvaux semble nous rapporter à peu près littéralement les termes mêmes de cette excuse. "Tu t'es excusé," dit-il en substance à son disciple, "et tu as bien fait. C'était un acte d'humilité. Mais n'est-ce pas aussi de l'humilité que d'obéir? Donc, plus d'excuses!" Et il continue:

> Fecisti utique quantum debuisti, si non plus quam debuisti. Quousque licuit processisti. Causa tuae impossibilitatis ostendisti, dicens te minus gram-

---

[21] *Vita s. Bercharii auctore Adsone*, 6; PL 137, 673-4.

[22] Scotti et reliqui sancti peregrini semper sibi dulcissimi habebantur. *Constantini vita Adalberoni* II; MGH, *Scriptores* IV, 668.

[23] Cf. Kenney, *op. cit.*, no. 432, p. 611.

[24] Cf. Louis Gougaud, *op. cit.*, p. 155 and Kenney, *op. cit.*, no. 433, p. 611.

[25] Moreover he collected no small crowd of Greek and Irish and fed this mixed body at his own expense. *Widrici vita s. Gerardi*, 19; ed. G. Waitz, MGH, *Scriptores* IV, 501. On the *peregrini* at Toul, Cf. Eugène Martin, *Histoire des diocèses de Toul, de Nancy et de Saint-Dié* (Nancy, 1900), pp. 176-7.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid.* Cf. Kenney, *op. cit.*, no, 431, p. 611.

[1] A. Wilmart, 'L'instigateur du *speculum caritatis* d'Aelred abbé de Rievault.' *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique*, XIV (1933), 369-395.

> maticum, immo pene illiteratum, qui de coquinis, non de scolis ad heremum ueneris, ubi, inter rupes et montes agrestis et rusticus uictitans, pro diurno pane in securi desudes et malleo, ubi magis discitur silere quam loqui, ubi sub habitu pauperum piscatorum coturnus non admittitur oratorum.

Sur quoi saint Bernard déclare qu'il accepte volontiers cette excuse, mais qu'il ne lui demande pas d'écrire sur ce que l'on apprend à l'école des grammairiens. "Elle me plaira davantage," lui dit-il, *si id proferas quod non in cujuslibet grammatici, sed in scola didiceris spiritus sancti."* Et pourquoi le Saint-Esprit ne tiendrait-il pas école dans la solitude? Saint Bernard du moins n'en doute pas:

> Sed nec ardua montium nec aspera rupium nec uallium concava perhorresco, cum in diebus istis montes stillent dulcedinem et colles fluant lac et mel, in quibus ualles abundant frumento, in quibus mel sugitur de petra, oleumque de saxo durissimo, et in rupibus et montibus sunt pascuae ouium Christi. Unde arbitror quod malleo illo tuo aliquid de rupibus illis excuderis quod sagacitate ingenii, de magistrorum scriniis non tulisses, et nonnunquam tale aliquid in meridiano feruore, sub umbris arborum senseris quale nunquam didicisses in scolis.[2]

La dernière phrase de ce texte est remarquable. Celle qui la précède est un véritable tissu de formules scripturaires, dont on sent assez la présence, et que Dom Wilmart a d'ailleurs identifiées, avec sa précision coutumière, dans les notes de l'édition qu'il a donnée de ce texte.[3] Pour emprunté qu'il soit, ce langage n'en est pas moins exact, puisqu'il décrit les fruits spirituels que recueillaient les religieux cisterciens, grâce au travail manuel pratiqué dans les solitudes où se construisaient leur monastères. Mais la dernière phrase n'évoque à la mémoire aucune source scripturaire, et l'expression n'y est pas moins personnelle que l'idée même qu'elle exprime. Seul, le maillet que tient Aelred vient encore d'une allusion antérieure à l'Ecriture,[4] mais ce que Bernard nous donne à entendre mérite d'être noté. Des pierres qu'il casse à coups de maillet, le moine peut extraire ce qu'il n'aurait pas tirées des écrins des maîtres, et parfois, dans la chaleur de midi, on ressent à l'ombre des arbres ce que l'on n'aurait jamais appris dans les écoles.

Ne faisons pas dire par saint Bernard ce qu'il ne dit pas. Son idée n'est pas que la science de la grammaire ou la culture des Lettres puisse s'acquérir à l'ombre des arbres aussi bien et mieux que dans les écoles. Ce n'est pas de savoir qu'il s'agit ici, ou, si c'en est un, c'est d'un savoir tout particulier. L'opposition même des formes dont il use est éloquente: *sub umbris arborum* senseris *quale nunquam* didicisses *in scolis.* D'une part, éprouver; de l'autre, apprendre. Si l'on songe à l'usage habituel de ce terme chez saint Bernard, on ne peut douter qu'il pense ici à une expérience religieuse et mystique, telle que celle de la présence du Verbe ou, sur un plan moins exalté, la suavité de la charité divine. Ainsi précisée, la pensée qu'exprime saint Bernard assume toute son importance. Elle suppose en effet que la vie cistercienne est en contact permanent avec la nature, et que les sites habituellement choisis pour les monastères cisterciens, dans une de ces vallées solitaires chéries de saint Bernard, aient été comme intégrés par lui à la vie mystique même. Sur le coup de midi, après le dur travail manuel d'un matin d'été, le disciple de saint Bernard rencontre Dieu à l'ombre des arbres, et il éprouve dans cette rencontre ce que nul lettré ne lui enseignera jamais. Lorsque Bernard loue Aelred de s'être instruit à cette école, c'est de savoir spirituel qu'il parle: *Dominus . . .*

---

[2] Wilmart, p. 390.

[3] Wilmart, p. 390, notes.

[4] *III Reg.*, vi, 7. Wilmart, p. 389 note 3, indique vi, 6, par erreur.

indoctum erudiuit, docuit imperitum, c'est-à-dire, le Seigneur l'a instruit à l'école de la charité.

ETIENNE GILSON
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

III. Chaucer's Hende Nicholas.

IN *The Miller's Tale* the poor scholar of Oxford, 'hende' Nicholas, dwelling with the carpenter and his young wife, is the character Chaucer created to fit the part of the accepted suitor and the object of the branding. Nicholas and his room are described briefly yet in sufficient detail to make him thoroughly individual: though a student of the arts he is more interested in astrology than in his studies and has acquired a local reputation as a weather prophet which serves him to good purpose in deceiving the carpenter; and he is a lover, sly and secret, although externally as meek as a maid. It would seem that Chaucer compensates for further detail, however, and gives us the key to the character and action of Nicholas by using the word *hende* with his name as an epithet eleven times[1]—often enough, indeed, to call attention to the word, especially since he is not accustomed to use epithets. In the sense of 'pleasant in dealing with others; courteous, gracious, kind, gentle, "nice" ' the word *hende* according to the *New English Dictionary*[2] was 'a conventional epithet of praise, very frequent in Middle English poetry.' This is, no doubt, one of the meanings which Chaucer attaches to the word. But as the poet repeats *hende* while the story unfolds, other meanings become appropriate to Nicholas at the same time; and it would seem that Chaucer chose *hende* as characteristic of Nicholas rather than *curteys* or something similar, because it does have several meanings which would occur to the audience as the tale is told. Things happen because Nicholas is 'hende'.

The first meaning which the *NED* gives for *hend* or *hende* is 'near, at hand,' but it points out that in this sense the word is used in Middle English only as a predicative and is hardly distinguishable from an abverb. Everyone, however, would have been familiar with this meaning because of its frequent occurrence in such a phrase as 'fer and hende.' Nicholas, being a boarder in Alisoun's house, is 'hende'—always near. This placing of the seducer in the household of the married couple, which apparently is original with Chaucer, is a good stroke. It gives Nicholas an advantage over his rival, Absolon, in proximity to the lady of their fancy—an advantage which is forcefully stated as follows:

> Ful sooth is this proverbe, it is no lye,
> Men seyn right thus, "Alwey the nye slye
> Maketh the ferre leeve to be looth."
> For though that Absolon be wood or wrooth,
> By cause that he fer was from hire sight,
> This nye Nicholas stood in his light.[3]

Proximity to Alisoun overpowers Nicholas; he must act. Proximity also makes it practically impossible for Alisoun to avoid 'this nye' Nicholas and is thus an extenuating circumstance calculated to diminish censure of her conduct; in other words, it makes it possible for her to act the part which the plot of the *fabliau* source demands without a comparable deterioration of her good character. And finally, the situation of the jealous old husband and the lover living under the same roof affords Chaucer many opportunities to display dramatic irony.[4]

---

[1] *Canterbury Tales,* I(A), 3199, 3272, 3386, 3397, 3401, 3462, 3487, 3526, 3742, 3832, 3856 ('The Reeve's Prologue'). The text used is *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer* edited by F. N. Robinson (Boston, 1933). There are no variant readings in John M. Manly and Edith Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), which affect the discussion.

[2] James A. H. Murray [*et al.*], ed. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles* (Oxford, 1888-1928). Judging from the dates of the quotations cited, all meanings of *hende* discussed in this paper were current in Chaucer's time.

[3] *CT,* I(A), 3391-3396.

Not only is Nicholas always at hand but he is also 'hende' in the sense of 'ready or skilful with the hand, dexterous'. Indeed, he is very ready with his hands, as four lines of Alisoun's protest in action and word are sufficient to show:

> And she sproong as a colt dooth in the trave.
>
> . . . .
>
> "Why, lat be," quod she, "lat be, Nicholas,
> Or I wol crie 'out, harrow' and 'allas'!
> Do wey youre handes, for youre curteisye."[5]

Professor Shelly writes: 'In love, as his actions show, he is master of the attack direct, and his technique is that of the country, not of the court.'[6] But neither is Alisoun's technique of resistance that of the court. The simile of the colt in the trave—'.i. at a forge' according to the gloss in *Ms Harley* 7333 for this line —[7] is one of the most brilliant action similes Chaucer ever wrote. From the truncated definition of *trave* in the glossaries of Chaucer texts[8] a careless reader might conclude that the poet is speaking of a colt in the shafts of a cart; but with the definition of the *NED* in mind—'A frame or enclosure of bars in which a restive horse is placed to be shod'—one can easily picture the leaping and kicking, the twisting and turning of a frightened colt being shod for the first time, and one can imagine the vigor and the futility of Alisoun's resistance to the superior strength of Nicholas. Moreover, the simile is appropriate because Chaucer has already said of Alisoun that

> Wynsynge she was, as is a joly colt.[9]

and he will have use for a smith and a forge before the story is over.

Upon the threat of Alisoun to call for help, however, Nicholas immediately changes his technique and becomes 'hende' in the polite sense of the epithet 'pleasant, gentle, courteous,' and thus

> This Nicholas gan mercy for to crye,
> And spak so fair, and profred him so faste,
> That she hir love hym graunted atte laste.[10]

It is to be noted that when Nicholas cries 'mercy' he is not asking pardon for having offended Alisoun; he is acting like the courtly lover, who declares his love to his lady by uttering the word 'mercy!'[11] Since this procedure is successful, nothing remains now for Nicholas except to contrive an assignation so that the husband will be never the wiser. Because he is 'hende' in still another sense, 'expert, skilful, clever', he plans the whole flood episode in great detail as a means to his end. He does not depend merely on his reputation as a student of astrology and a forecaster of weather to convince the carpenter of the imminence of a worse flood than that of Noe, but he prepares an elaborate setting for his prediction by remaining locked in his room for two days before the carpenter with deep concern shakes him from his feigned trance and revives the glibness of his tongue with his share of a large quart of mighty ale.[12] Then his prophecy and his plan for the salvation of the carpenter, Alisoun, and himself come pouring out. Such contriving is worthy of the brain of the Pandarus who planned the dinner party of Trojan royalty at the house of Deiphebus so that Troilus might have an opportunity to speak for a short time with Criseyde without arousing suspicion of their love. The *NED* gives still another meaning for *hende,* ‘pleasing to the sight, comely, fair, “nice.” ’ Since Chaucer does not describe the appearance of ‘hende’ Nicholas, perhaps one is also expected to infer from the epithet that he is pleasing to the sight. At least Alisoun finds neither his person nor his plans repugnant.

---

[4] See Germaine Dempster, *Dramatic Irony in Chaucer* (Stanford University Publications, University Series, Language and Literature, vol. IV, no. 3 [1932]), pp. 36-38.

[5] *CT*, I(A), 3282, 3285-3287.

[6] Percy Van Dyke Shelly, *The Living Chaucer* (Philadelphia, 1940), p. 245.

[7] Manly and Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales*, III, 490.

[8] Robinson: 'wooden frame for holding horses.' Skeat: 'a wooden frame for holding unruly horses.' R. M. Lumiansky modernizes the simile as follows (The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer [New York, 1948], p. 57): 'She sprang aside like a colt in the traces.'

[9] *CT*, I(A), 3263.

[10] *CT*, I(A), 3288-3290.

[11] Speaking of courtly lovers Nevill Coghill writes in *The Poet Chaucer* (London, 1949), p. 16: . . . even after long service of which she may be quite unconscious, mercy is as much as he can ask, and to say that one word *"Mercy!"* is in Chaucer the characteristic form of a lover's declaration of his passion.

The climax of *The Miller's Tale* takes place when Nicholas is ‘hende’’ once too often. Bent on avening Alisoun's insult to his dignity, Absolon returns from the smithy of Gerveys with a hot colter. By this time, however, ‘hende’ Nicholas has risen and is *at hand,* and being *clever* he thinks he will improve upon the coarse trick performed by Alisoun. He does ‘amenden al the jape,’ not in the way he had anticipated, but by bringing about crude and effective poetic justice.

Thus, by giving Nicholas the epithet ‘hende,’ Chaucer keeps the character of this ‘nye slye’ always before the attention of his audience; and from the time that the Miller first uses it until the Canterbury Pilgrims laugh at the end of the farsical adventures of Absolon and ‘hende’ Nicholas[13] the word grows in meaning and importance. No modern word has all the facets of ***hende*** which Chaucer utilized.

Paul E. Beichner C.S.C.
University of Notre Dame.

IV. A Brief Historical Comment on St. Thomas, *Summa theol.* III, qu. 67, a. 5: *Utrum non baptizatus possit sacramentum baptismi conferre.*

THE fact that St. Thomas raises the question whether an unbaptized person can confer Baptism reveals that he was keenly aware of a difficulty which is almost unknown to most later theologians preoccupied as they seem to be with intention, matter and form in judging the valid administration of Baptism. St. Thomas mentions that St. Augustine failed to come to a decision on this problem.[1] As his first objection proves, St. Thomas also realized that the primary difficulty was based on, or caused by, the principle: *Nullus dat quod non habet.* Moreover, St. Thomas saw that the question was not whether an unbaptized person could apply matter and form with the proper intention, but whether he had to be a member of the Church in order to be able to impart or communicate something that he had received from the Church. For his own solution of the problem, the author of the *Summa* claims the support of a decision made by Pope Nicholas I (858-867) who declared valid the Baptism of a great many people conferred by a Jew of whom it was unknown whether he had been previously baptized or not. "They are not to be baptized again", the Pope had stated, "if they had been baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity or only in the name of Christ".[2] St. Thomas also claims that a decretal of Pope "Gregory II to Bishop Boniface" is to be understood in the same sense, although this document, issued by Pope Gregory III about the year 732, seems to advocate the very opposite doctrine: *Quos a paganis baptizatos esse asseruisti, si ita habetur, ut denuo baptizes in nomine Trinitatis mandamus.*[3] According to St. Thomas, however, one has to suppose that they had not been baptized "in the form of the Church". In addition to these texts, St. Thomas cites a passage from "Isidore", copied either from Lombard's *Sentences* or Gratian's *Decretum*,[4] which reads: *Romanus Pontifex non hominem judicat, qui baptizat, sed Spiritum Dei subministrare gratiam baptismi, licet paganus sit qui baptizet.*

---

[12] Germaine Dempster writes (*Dramatic Irony in Chaucer,* p. 37) that none of the extant analogues offers the least parallel to the trance scene and that ‘such a long, careful, and humorous introduction to the account of a few coarse tricks suggests no other hand but Chaucer's.’

[13] *CT,* I(A), 3199 and 3856.

[1] *Contra Ep. Parmeniani* II, 13, 30; CSEL 51, 81: Et haec quidem alia quaestio est: utrum et ab his, qui numquam fuerunt christiani, possit baptismus dari. Nec aliquid hinc temere affirmandum est sine auctoritate tanti concilii, quantum tantae rei sufficit. It is worth noting that, by the word *paganus,* St. Thomas means an unbaptized person, including the Jews. In this article, the word "pagan Baptism" is used to designate Baptism administered by any unbaptized person.

If we examine the history of the objections and the sources cited by St. Thomas, we shall find that they are the result of a long doctrinal conflict based on the idea that, in baptizing, the minister imparts something that he once received and now possesses. At the end of the second century, Tertullian demanded a revision of the stand concerning Baptism conferred by heretics and his view that it should be rejected[5] as invalid found an ardent follower in St. Cyprian. Needless to say, all those in both East and West who opposed the validity of trinitarian Baptism conferred by heretics, *a fortiori* rejected trinitarian Baptism conferred by pagans. In voicing his opinion on Baptism administered by baptized laymen, Tertullian sanctions such Baptism on the strength of the principle: "For that which is received alike by all, can be by all alike conferred."[6] In other words, they confer something that they have received. When St. Cyprian refused to recognize the validity of heretical Baptism, exclaiming: *Quis autem potest dare quod ipse non habet*,[7] he had a similar thought in mind. In the next century, the Donatists turned the same axiom against the validity of Catholic Baptism saying: *Qui non habet quod det, quomodo dat?* Although St. Optatus retorted that this principle "had not been read in a book, but had been brought in from the street",[8] he was influenced by it and defended only Baptism conferred by schismatics, since they were not entirely separated from the Christian communion: "In part of the garment we are still one, but we hang on different sides."[9]

St. Augustine did not question the principle. In fact, his difficulty concerning Baptism conferred by non-Christians was caused precisely by his belief that even heretics and laymen give something that they have previously received in Baptism: *Nulla jam quaestio est, quod et habeant et dare possint.*[10] This did not seem to him to be true in the case of pagans and he felt that only a Council could settle the problem.[11] Later on, he professed that, if he were called upon to state his view at a General Council, he would advocate the validity of trinitarian Baptism, no matter where and by whom it was administered, provided that men whose decision he would prefer to follow did not voice a contrary opinion.[12] We need not doubt that, if a custom of accepting trinitarian Baptism conferred by pagans had existed in his time, St. Augustine would not have considered it "rash" to proclaim or disclaim its validity. His readiness to deny its validity if men whose learning he respected denied it, is eloquent proof of his doubts and the non-existence of a tradition of accepting pagan Baptism. At any rate, he thought that, to be valid, Baptism administered by a pagan had to be *received* seriously and "with some faith".[13]

---

[2] *Responsa ad consulta Bulgarorum*, 104: Mansi, *Concilia* XV, 432. Date: November 866. The text is found in Gratian, *Decretum* D. 4, qu. 24 de cons. and in *Sentences* IV, d. 3, c. 3: ed. *Quaracchi* (1916), p. 756.

[3] Gratian, *Decretum* D. 4, qu. 52 de cons. Mansi, *Concilia* XII, 278B and MGH, *Epp.* 3, 279.

[4] *Sent.* IV, d. 5, c. 2; *ed. cit.*, p. 774. Gratian, *Decretum* D. IV, qu. 23 de cons.

[5] *De Baptismo*, 15; CSEL 20, 213 f.

[6] *Ibid.*, 17; p. 214.

[7] *Ep. LXX*, 2; CSEL 3^2, 769. Applied to Holy Orders conferred by heretics, the Cyprianic argument was often repeated during the Gregorian Reform movement.

[8] *Libri Septem* V, 6; CSEL 26, 132.

[9] *Ibid.* III, 9; p. 93.

[10] *Contra Ep. Parm.* II, 13, 30; CSEL 51, 81.

[11] *Ibid.*

[12] *De Baptismo* VII, 53, 102; CSEL 51, 373 f.

No wonder that later generations shared St. Augustine's doubts, even if they did not openly deny the validity of such Baptism. The uncertainty expressed by him lasted for many centuries. When, in the eighth century, St. Boniface sent his enquiries to Pope Gregory III, he must have been faced with trinitarian Baptism conferred by unbaptized ministers. Otherwise he would not have raised the question. He was not told by the Pope to investigate if the proper form and matter had been used; the papal order reads: . . . *ut denuo baptizes in nomine Trinitatis mandamus.* In the following century, similar enquiries reached Rome from Bulgaria. The enquirers did not know what to do about a great number of people who had been baptized by a certain Jew of whom they did not know if he had been baptized or not. To those who, in later years, read only the excerpt of the decretal in Ivo's *Panormia*,[14] Abelard's *Sic et Non*,[15] Gratian's *Decretum* or Lombard's *Sentences*, the answer given by Pope Nicholas I must have appeared quite clear, with the possible exception of the recognition of Baptism conferred "in the name of Christ". However, the full text of the papal reply reveals unmistakable signs of uncertainty. Instead of suggesting that the enquirers examine the intention and whether the proper form and matter were used, Pope Nicholas tells them to investigate *first* whether the Jew himself was a Christian or a pagan or whether he became a Christian afterwards. Somehow, it seems obvious, Pope Nicholas did not wish to make a definite decision. Rather than indicate to his correspondents for what purpose or reason the enquiry into the Jew's own Baptism was to be made, he refers them to St. Augustine,[16] although these texts do not show St. Augustine's thought on Baptism conferred by a non-Christian.[17] The papal decretal is by no means a firm recognition of pagan Baptism, because it was probably known in Rome that, particularly in the North, there were strong currents against the recognition of its validity.

Definitely opposed was the view attributed to Theodore of Canterbury who is supposed to have declared: *Baptizati a presbytero non baptizato iterum debent baptizari.*[18] In an enlarged form, the same doctrine is found in the *Canones* circulated under the name of either Theodore or Pope Gregory, where we read: *Si quis ordinatus sit per ignorantiam antequam baptizatus, debent baptizari qui ab illo gentili baptizati fuerunt. Et ipse non ordinetur.*[19] While this canon forbids the unbaptized "priest" to be ordained again, another canon which belongs to the same school of thought orders that he be baptized and that both his Ordination and all Baptisms conferred by him be repeated: *Si quis presbyter ordinatus deprehendit se non esse baptizatum, baptizetur et ordinetur iterum. Et omnes*

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 374. In *De Unico baptismo*, 4, 4; CSEL 53, 5, St. Augustine explicitly recognizes the validity of Baptism conferred by Jews.

[14] *Panormia* I, 29; PL 161, 1052.

[15] Cap. 110; PL 178, 1505BC. See also Alger, *De Sacramento* III, 6; PL 180, 838C.

[16] *De Baptismo* IV, 15, 22 and V, 27, 38; CSEL 51, 247 and 295.

[17] The significant part of the decretal reads: . . . constat eos non denuo baptizandos, sed primum utrum christianus an paganus ipse Judaeus extiterit vel si postmodum factus fuerit christianus, investigandum est, quamvis non praetereundum esse credamus quid beatus de baptismo dicat Augustinus: Jam satis, inquit, ostendimus . . .

[18] *Judicium de poenitentia Theodori episcopi*, 64; ed. P. W. Finsterwalder, *Die Canones Theodori Cantuarensis* (Weimar, 1929), p. 275. Perhaps in dependence on this teaching, the Venerable Bede, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum* XIX, 5; ed. M. L. W. Laistner (Cambridge, Mass., 1939), p. 70, rejects the validity of such Baptism because its minister is "without the succession" of Christ. Bede's text was copied by Smaragdus, *Collectiones* (PL 102, 322D), and by the author of the *Glossa ordinaria* (PL 114, 462B). Hrabanus Maurus (PL 110, 252C) knew but ignored the text. Apparently it was never quoted or discussed by later authors.

[19] *Canones s. Gregorii*, 23; ed. Finsterwalder, p. 254. H. Wasserschleben, *Die Bussordnungen der abendl. Kirche* (Halle, 1851), p. 195. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and eccl. Documents* III (Oxford, 1871), p. 185. J. T. McNeill, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance* (New York, 1938), p. 193.

quos prius baptizavit baptizentur.[20] Though varying in form and severity, these three canons voice the conviction that Baptism administered by an unbaptized minister has no validity. It was not a question of matter, form or intention. Ignorant of his lack of Baptism, the "priest" may have been in excellent standing, he may have performed the Baptismal rite conscientiously using the right matter and form with the proper intention, yet his Baptisms were not to be considered valid.

That this doctrine, in such definite and categorical form, was of Eastern rather than Western origin is beyond doubt, and we may safely assume that it reflects the influence of Theodore of Canterbury (d.690). On the strength of St. Augustine's attitude and influence in this matter, we may also assume that it was received with scepticism. This then may account for St. Boniface's enquiry, and we have seen that the reply given by Pope Gregory III was in line with the teaching formulated in the *Canones Theodori.*

In view of the date of Pope Gregory's decretal which was issued about the year 732, it will appear strange to read that Pope Sergius I (687-701) had already "said" that Baptism conferred by an unbaptized "priest" is valid. A capitulary, issued by Pippin at Compiègne (757) declares:

> Si quis baptizatus est a presbytero non baptizato et sancta Trinitas in ipso baptismo invocata fuerit, baptizatus est sicut Sergius Papa dixit. Impositione vero manuum episcopi indiget. <Georgius episcopus Romanus et Johannes sacellarius sic senserunt>.[21]

In the following century, Benedict Levita incorporated this capitulary in his collection,[22] without realizing perhaps, that it conflicted with two chapters of the same work. The first is identical with the third canon quoted from the *Canones Theodori*[23] and rejects Baptism conferred by an unbaptized minister. The second also rejects it and seems to be an enlarged version of the reply given to St. Boniface by Pope Gregory III. It reads: *Praecipimus ut, qui a paganis baptizati sunt, denuo a Christi sacerdotibus in nomine sanctae Trinitatis baptizentur et postea ab episcopis chrismentur, quia aliter christiani nec dici nec esse possunt.*[24]

The declaration of Compiègne may be the result of corrections which appeared in the *Canones Theodori* or the corrections may have influenced the declaration. It is well known that several doctrines contained in those canons were received with doubt. Thus the canon which states: "If one is baptized by a heretic who does not rightly believe in the Trinity, he shall be rebaptized", is followed by the remark: "This we do not believe Theodore to have said".[25] Similarly, the doctrine that anyone ordained through ignorance before receiving Baptism should be rebaptized and not ordained again and that all Baptisms conferred by him were to be repeated, received the following annotation:

> This, again, is *said* to have been differently determined by the Roman Pontiff of the Apostolic See, to the effect that not he who baptizes, even if he is a pagan, but the Spirit of God ministers the grace of Baptism. But also the case of the pagan presbyter who thinks himself baptized and holds the Catholic faith in his works has been decided differently, (for) elsewhere these decisions state that he should be baptized and ordained.[26]

The annotator had heard or read that a Roman Pontiff had recognized the validity of pagan Baptism; he also knew that "elsewhere" these same canons of Theodore were more lenient with regard to the re-Ordination of the "priest" who was not aware of the fact that he had not been baptized.

---

[20] *Libellus Discipuli Umbrensium* II, ii, 13; ed. Finsterwalder, p. 314.

[21] *Capit. Com.*, c. 12; MGH, *LL* I, 28. The authenticity of the last sentence is not certain.

[22] *Capit.* I, 6; MGH, *LL* II, 2, 46.

[23] *Capit.* II, 94; p. 78.

[24] *Capit.* III, 401; p. 127.

[25] *Libellus Disc. Umbrensium* I, v, 6; ed. Finsterwalder, p. 287.

[26] *Libellus* I, ix, 12; ed. Finsterwalder, p. 303. The translation in McNeill, *Medieval Handbooks*, p. 193 is inaccurate.

In the second half of the tenth century, this comment or correction entered the so-called *Confessional of Egbert* as follows:

> Omnis presbyter qui noverit quod non sit baptizatus baptizetur et omnes illi quos antea baptizaverat. Papa Romanus statuit: etiamsi presbyter peccator sit vel gentilis, ministerium Spiritus sancti esse nihilominus in gratia baptismi, non hominis.[27]

At the beginning of the succeeding century, Burchard of Worms also copied two contradictory canons: the first from Benedict Levita under the spurious heading: *Ex Concilio apud Compendium, cap. 5;* the second from another source under the spurious title: *Ex dictis sancti Isidori episcopi.*[28] Since this false attribution explains the appearance of St. Isidore's name in the *Summa,* we may transcribe the full text:

> Ex dictis sancti Isidori episcopi: Si quis per ignorantiam ordinatur antequam baptizetur, debent ab eo baptizati baptizari. Et ipse non ordinetur. Sed Romanus Pontifex judicat non hominem qui baptizat sed Spiritum Dei subministrare gratiam baptismi, licet paganus sit qui baptizet.

Who then is the *Romanus Pontifex* or *Papa Romanus* credited with the doctrine that pagan Baptism is valid? According to the capitulary of Compiègne (757), it was Pope Sergius (687-701) who gave the decision. The verb *dixit* instead of *dicit* may point to some oral statement rather than a written decree, and the capitulary would thus constitute an oral tradition. We read in the same document that Bishop George, a Roman, and John, the keeper of his purse, held the same belief with regard to pagan Baptism. They had been sent by Pope Stephen II to put Pippin on guard against iconoclasm[29] and were obviously well qualified to state the Roman attitude at the time of their mission. There is, in addition, some written evidence pertaining to this matter. A relatively unknown and rare canonical compilation which Maassen calls *The Collection in 400 chapters* attributes to Pope Sergius two chapters on which the declaration of Compiègne may well be based. The first chapter severely condemns a "priest" who receives Holy Orders and exercises the priestly office *knowing* that he had never been baptized. The second chapter decrees that, if a priest thought he had been baptized and then discovers and proves that this was not so, he should after due penance be baptized and ordained. It concludes with the words: *Hi vero, qui ab eo baptizati sunt, sic in ecclesia permanent.*[30] Since these decisions are not found in the extant decretals of Pope Sergius I, their authenticity is not entirely above suspicion, but it is safe to assume that Pope Sergius is the *Papa* or *Pontifex Romanus* credited with the recognition of pagan Baptism.

Carolingian theologians remained remarkably silent on this issue. A faint trace is found in the *Responsa canonica* attributed to Rhabanus Maurus. The case is that of a person who pretended to be a priest and conferred Baptism. He is to be asked if, when he baptized, *he himself was baptized* and if he baptized in the name of the Trinity with triple immersion. The significance of this enquiry lies in the words: *requirendum est utrum ipse baptizans baptizatus esset,* for the author must have felt the answer concerning the subsequent procedure depended on the minister's own Baptism. Like Pope Nicholas, he does not specify what is to be done if it can be proven that the imposter was not baptized.[31]

---

[27] Ed. Wasserschleben, p. 305.

[28] *Decretum* IV, 74 and 100; PL 140, 741A and 748D. The first canon reads: Si quis presbyter ordinatus deprehenderit se non esse baptizatum, baptizetur et ordinetur iterum et omnes quos prius baptizavit.

[29] Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles* III², (Paris, 1910), p. 942.

[30] F. Maassen, *Gesch. der Quellen und der Lit. des can. Recht* (Gratz, 1870), p. 972.

From the *Decretum* of Burchard our canons entered the canonical collections of Ivo of Chartres with their spurious titles. Hence we find as a capitulary of Compiègne a canon which was originally attributed to Theodore.[32] The passage which Burchard ascribed to St. Isidore appears in two forms: the complete text[33] and the second part beginning with the words *Romanus Pontifex*.[34] From Benedict Levita, Ivo copied the authentic capitulary of Compiègne which credits Pope Sergius with the recognition of pagan Baptism.[35]

Of these canons, the authentic capitulary of Compiègne did not pass on to Gratian's *Decretum*. The spurious capitulary of Compiègne, i.e., the canon which originally demanded re-Baptism for those baptized by an unbaptized "priest", appears in Gratian only as a *Palea* stating that an unbaptized priest should be baptized and ordained.[36] The canonists knew that the sentence that demanded that all those baptized by him should be rebaptized was either missing or deleted in many manuscripts and, accordingly, disagreed on the interpretation of the *Palea*.[37] The canon preceding the *Palea* offers the complete "Isidorian" canon, the wording of which we traced back to Burchard from whom Ivo, Gratian's source, had copied it.[38] From Ivo's *Panormia*, Gratian transcribed also the second part of the complete canon beginning with *Romanus Pontifex*.[39] It is followed by the excerpt from the decretal of Pope Nicholas I which Gratian had found in the same collection, i.e., the *Panormia*.[40] Likewise from Ivo is Gratian's canon which dates back to Pope Gregory III ordering that those baptized by pagans be rebaptized.[41]

The results of this study show that St. Thomas made use of three *auctoritates* available in his sources, i.e., "Isidore", the excerpt from the decretal of Pope Nicholas I and the decision of Pope Gregory III. He did not use the *Palea* and the "Isidorian" canon preceding it and one may justly wonder why he did not cite the Lateran Council of 1215 which had declared: *Baptismum . . . in forma ecclesiae a quocumque collatum proficit ad salutem*.[42] Of the three auctoritates quoted by St. Thomas, both "Isidore" and (the excerpt from the decretal of) Pope Nicholas recognized pagan Baptism as valid. Pope Gregory III did not.

Since Peter Lombard did not mention Gregory's reply to St. Boniface, the theologians who found in his *Sentences* a handy, if not fully adequate, source for patristic doctrines, generally failed to discuss the decretal, though they approved pagan Baptism as valid on the strength of the other two *auctoritates*, i.e., "Isidore" and Pope Nicholas both of whom were cited by Lombard.[43] The solution offered by St. Thomas is taken from the canonists who had long been confronted with the task of reconciling the conflicting canons. Huguccio, whom we can consider as representative of the teaching in the last quarter of the twelfth century, affirms that Pope Gregory ordered re-Baptism "if they were baptized without the form of the Church".[44] We need not repeat that the decretal does not contain this condition or supposition. The canonical *Glossa* is just as brief and attributes to Joan(nes Faventinus) the same statement.[45] At a later date, the difficulty was ignored.[46]

---

[31] *Responsa canonica* VI; PL 110, 1193CD.

[32] *Decretum* I, 268 and *Panormia* I, 96; PL 161, 122C and 1066B compared with Burchard, *Decretum* IV, 74; PL 140, 741A. Cf. Abelard, *Sic et Non*, 110; PL 178, 1506A.

[33] *Decretum* I, 294 and *Pan.* I, 97; PL 161, 130C and 1066C compared with Burchard, *Decretum* IV, 100; PL 140, 748D. Cf. *Summa Sent.* V, 7; PL 176, 134A.

[34] *Panormia* I, 27; PL 161, 1052C.

[35] *Decretum* I, 175; PL 161, 104A.

[36] Gratian, *Decretum* C. 1, qu. 1, c. 60.

[37] The *Glossa in Decretum* C. 1, qu. 1, c. 60; ed. Lyons (1560), fol. 522, notes: Alii legunt causam *plene* et dicunt quod baptizati ab eo debent rebaptizari. Sed male dicunt. Unde illud *Sed Romanus* est correctivum.

[38] *Decretum* C. 1, qu. 1, c. 59.

[39] *Decretum* D. 4, c. 23 de cons.

[40] *Pan.* I, 29; PL 161, 1052D.

[41] Gratian, *Decretum* D. 4, c. 52 de cons., and Ivo, *Decretum* XI, 91; PL 161, 776A. Gratian explicitly raises the question of pagan Baptism in *Decretum* D. IV, c. 31 de cons. He cites Augustine, *De Bapt.* VII, 53, 101; CSEL 51, 372, copied from Ivo, *Decretum* I, 162; PL 161, 97D.

[42] *Decr. Greg.* L. 1, T. 1, c. 1.

[43] In his *Script. super Sent.* IV, d. 5, qu. 2, a. 1; ed. M. F. Moos (Paris, 1947), p. 213, St. Thomas does not yet mention Gregory's decretal. He only cites the *Romanus Pontifex* passage from Lombard's text.

[44] *Summa in Decretum;* Ms Paris, B. N. *Lat.* 3892, fols. 390 and 386ᵛ.

St. Thomas had also learned from his canonical studies that in the question of pagan Baptism the principle *Nullus dat quod non habet* was involved. With reference to *Decretum* C. 1, q. 1, c. 1, the glossator relates that against pagan Baptism the objection was raised: *Nemo dare potest quod non habet.* His solution is based on Roman Law and not particularly convincing: *Sed creditor dominium rei sibi obligatae post biennium in alium transfert, quod tamen non habet.*[47] Huguccio had already pointed to a better answer based on the Augustinian doctrine that it is Christ who baptizes.[48] St. Thomas adopts a similar argument: Christ baptizes internally. He can impart the external ministry to any human being and the teaching of the Church shows that he does. Although an unbaptized minister may not be in communion with the Church *re vel sacramento,* he can belong to it through his intention and "the similarity of his action" by intending to do what the Church does and by observing the form used in the Church.

Nicholas M. Haring S.A.C.
Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

V. Pseudo-Alcuin's *Liber de divinis officiis* and the *Liber 'Dominus vobiscum'* of St. Peter Damiani.

THE *Liber 'Dominus vobiscum'* of Damiani[1] attracted the attention of modern liturgists at an early date[2] and the little tract and its author continue to be held in esteem by liturgical scholars.[3] It was written before Damiani became Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia in 1057 and while he was still prior of the hermitage at Fonte Avellana.[4] His purpose was to explain that it was not inane for the solitary in his cell to use the customary plural forms and salutations of liturgical prayer, such as *Dominus vobiscum, Jube, domne, benedicere, Oremus,* etc., because of the mystery of the unity of the Church (*sacramentum unitatis ecclesiasticae*). In the course of this exposition he digresses to insert a brief chapter on the hidden meaning of the rites and vestments of both Old and New Testament worship.[5] No details, he insists, can be considered *frivola* or *levia* in these sacred offices by one who seeks in them the *virtus spiritualis intelligentiae.* He prompts the reader to consider in particular this 'spiritual meaning' in the several sacred vestments by introducing a series of questions on sandals, alb, amice, cincture, stole, dalmatic, chasuble, maniple and pallium, in that order. He does not, however, provide his reader with the answers. He either assumed that the answers would be known, or, what is more likely, that the reader would be moved to seek them out in the works of the learned expositors as Damiani himself had done.[6]

---

[45] *Glossa in Decretum* D. 4, c. 52 de cons; ed. Lyons (1560), fol. 1955.

[46] Cf. Archidiaconus, *Super Decr.* D. 4, c. 52 de cons.; ed. Lyons (1516), fol. 341.

[47] *Glossa in Decr.* D. 4 c. 23 de cons.; *ed. cit.*, fol. 1939.

[48] *Loc. cit.*, fol. 386^{v}.

[1] Ed. C. Gaetani, *Opera* III (1615), *Opusc.* XI: *Liber qui appellatur Dominus vobiscum ad Leonem eremitam.* The Migne edition is used here, PL 145, 231-52.

[2] G. Ferrari added the *Lib. Dominus vobiscum* in his edition (Rome, 1591) of M. Hittorp, *De divinis catholicae ecclesiae officiis.*

[3] L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik* I (Freiburg i. Br., 1932), p. 125, comments: Aus Italien stammt . . . das schöne Büchlein über das Dominus vobiscum aus der Feder des für die würdige Feier der Liturgie durchglühten hl. Petrus Damiani. I have been unable to see A. Kolping, *Petrus Damiani. Das Büchlein von "Dominus vobiscum"* (Düsseldorf, 1949).

[4] F. Neukirch, *Das Leben des Petrus Damiani* (Göttingen, 1875), p. 95 (num. 28), dates it *ca.* 1048 - *ca.* 1055.

[5] *Opusc.* XI, c. 17: (*tit.*) Quod quidquid pene in divinis officiis agitur, sub figuris mysticis disponatur (PL 145, 245).

[6] *Op. cit.*, c. 18: Verum his, quae ab eruditis expositoribus expedita probantur, omissis, id quod tractandum suscepimus . . . adhuc breviter replicemus (245D).

At this date the allegorical interpretation of the sacred rites and vestments was no novelty but had been fully developed by the earlier commentators on the liturgy. Much common material had been handed down and embellished through Bede,[7] Amalarius[8] and Rabanus Maurus,[9] to mention only the more widely read commentators. Indeed Walafrid Strabo (d. 849) considered it superfluous to add anything to the comments of his predecessors on the mystical meaning of the liturgical vestments.[10] It may safely be assumed that Damiani, who was widely read, was familiar with this literature. Bede and Amalarius are named among the authors whose works he had acquired (and corrected!) for the monks at Fonte Avellana.[11]

I suggest, however, that it is not to the better known liturgical commentaries but rather to the anonymous *Liber de divinis officiis* that we must look both for Damiani's inspiration in the present instance and for the answers to his cryptic questions on the details of the liturgical costume. This tenth-century treatise was erroneously attributed to Alcuin in the collection of Melchior Hittorp, first published in Cologne, 1568, but was relegated to the *Opera supposititia* in the edition of Alcuin's works.[12] It is now generally recognized, after some earlier uncertainties, as a compilation, not without its own merits, done shortly before 950.[13] The affinity between Damiani and Pseudo-Alcuin can best be shown, I believe, by the following comparison of the texts.

DAMIANI	PSEUDO-ALCUIN
Lib. 'Dominus vobiscum'	Lib. de divinis officiis
c. 17 . . . cur sandalia clericorum pedes quidem a terra dividunt, pedum autem superiora ex parte tegunt, ex parte non tegunt.	c. 39 (1) Sandalia dicuntur soleae. Est autem genus calceamenti . . . subterius quidem solea muniens pedes a terra; superius vero, nil operimenti habens, patet . . . Significat autem ministrum verbi Dei non debere terrenis incumbere, sed potius coelestibus inhiare, et praedicationem suam nulli occultare.
. . . cur poderis usque ad talos defluat,	(3) Postea sequitur poderis, quae vulgo alba dicitur. Significat autem perseverantiam in bona actione . . . Tunica usque ad talum, est opus bonum usque ad consummationem, in talo enim finis est corporis.
cur superhumerale ex lini materia semper fiat;	(2) Post sandalias in Ecclesiae vestimentis, sequitur superhumerale, quod fit ex lino purissimo. Per linum quod ex terra sumitur, et per multos labores

---

[7] Bede, *De tabernaculo et vasis ejus, ac vestibus sacerdotum;* especially *Lib.* III, c. 3-8 on vestments (PL 91, 466-83).

[8] Amalarius, *Liber officialis*, ed. J. Hanssens, *Opera* II (Studi e Testi, CXXXIX, Vatican City, 1948); especially *Lib.* II, c. 15-26 on vestments (*ibid.*, pp. 236 ff.).

[9] Rabanus, *De clericorum institutione*; see especially *Lib.* I, c. 14-23 on vestments (PL 107, 306-9).

[10] *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, c. 25: Addiderunt in vestibus sacris alii alia vel ad imitationem eorum, quibus veteres utebantur sacerdotes, vel ad mystcae significationis expressionem. Quid enim singula designent, quibus nunc utimur, a prioribus nostrs satis expolitum est (MGH, Capitularia II, 2, p. 504).

[11] *Opusc.* XIV (1045/1050), PL 145, 334D.

[12] PL 101, 1173-1286. The Migne edition is used here.

[13] Cf. L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch* I, p. 121; and the eralier notice of F. Cabrol, *DACL* I, 1 (1924), 1089.

	ad candorem ducitur, designatur corpus humanum, quod ex terra constat. Sicut ergo linum . . . , ita corpus humanum multis calamitatibus attritum, candidum et purum esse debet ab omni sorde peccatorum.
perpendit etiam, quid cingulum,	(4) Deinde sequitur zona, quae cingulum dicitur, qua restringitur poderis, ne laxe per pedes diffluat. Per quam designatur discretio omnium virtutum: virtutes enim sine discretione . . . vitia sunt; nam virtutes in quodam meditullio sunt constitutae.
quid designat orarium;	(5) Orarium, id est stola, dicitur eo quod oratoribus . . . concedatur. Admonet illum, qui illo induitur, ut memor sit, sub jugo Christi . . . esse se constitutum.
. . . cur in modum crucis sit quadrata dalmatica;	(6) Dalmatica . . . Est autem vestimentum in modum crucis, monens indutorem suum crucifixum esse debere mundo . . .
cur reliquis indumentis sit superponenda casula,	(8) Casula quae super omnia indumenta ponitur, significat charitatem, quae alias virtutes excellit.
cur etiam manipulus in sinistra parte gestetur, quo nimirum spiritualium potius, quam carnalium oculorum, vel narium pituita detergitur.	(7) Mappula quae sinistra parte gestatur, qua pituitam oculorum et narium detergimus, praesentem vitam designat, in qua superfluos humores patimur.
. . . cur diaconus, qui dalmatica non est indutus, casula circumcinctus legat;	Diaconus, qui non est indutus dalmatica, casula circumcinctus legit, ut expedite possit ministrare;
cur etiam ipsa dalmatica in sinistra sui parte fimbrias habeat.	Habet etiam [dalmatica] in sinistra parte sui fimbrias. Per sinistram partem praesens vita figuratur, quae diversis curis abundat; quae curae significantur per fimbrias sinistrae partis;
. . . nec illa consuetudo inaniter tenuit, quod pallium pontificalibus indumentis apponitur, ut lamina in fronte pontificis ad decorem et gloriam antiquitus ponebatur (cf. *Exod.*, xxviii, 36, 40): in qua nimirum lamina nomen Domini tetragrammaton scriptum erat, quod sanctum Domini vocabatur, paucis	(9) Pallium archiepiscoporum super omnia indumenta est, ut lamina in fronte pontificis . . . Hoc etiam erat lamina illa . . . in qua scriptum erat nomen Dei tetragrammaton, id est, quatuor litterarum . . . Est autem interpretatio, *Jod*, principium, *He* iste, *Vau*, vita, et *Heth* passio, id est: Iste

quidem litteris constans, sed magni intellectus virtutem interius continens.	est principium passionis vitae . . . etc. Vocabatur autem hoc nomen sanctum Domini . . .

It will be noted that Damiani does not follow exactly the order of the items in Pseudo-Alcuin (given above in parentheses). It is also quite true that similar comment on some of the items is to be found in the earlier writers, especially Amalarius, from whom Pseudo-Alcuin borrowed freely. But Pseudo-Alcuin alone, of the commentators I have examined, has all the details on the sacred vestments singled out by Damiani. A verbal concordance with some of the characteristic phrases of the *Liber de divinis officiis* strengthens the conclusion that Damiani is dependent on this compilation. This is not to say, of course, that the earlier commentaries were unfamiliar to him. Some questions, in fact, which follow the series on the vestments, suggest that he had more than Pseudo-Alcuin in mind.[14]

Viewed in the light of the traditional literature in these matters there is not an original or characteristic note in Damiani's whole chapter. Viewed apart from it the chapter has little meaning. For this reason it is somewhat surprising to find a recent reference to the significance of his application to the divine offices of the Old and New Law of the *allegorica theoria*.[15] I am sure that Damiani intended to say no more than had been said by the *eruditi expositores*, to whom he had gone himself and in whom he would in turn excite his reader's interest.

But despite its lack of the originality so conspicuous in the rest of the work, this chapter is far from being the least interesting in Damiani's little treatise. Was the *Liber de divinis officiis* in circulation in Italy around the year 1050? Or was its chapter on the sacred vestments put to use by someone else and known to Damiani through this other medium? Such a possibility is suggested at least by the fact that the name of Damiani has already been linked, however indirectly, with the work of Pseudo-Alcuin. It was first established by M. Andrieu that the *Liber de divinis officiis* was used by the compiler of the *Ordo romanus antiquus* (*ca.* 950),[16] which was incorporated in the celebrated Mainz pontifical to which the same eminent liturgist has given the title *Le pontifical romano-germanique du Xᵉ siècle*. Dom Wilmart later pointed out that three of the prayers for the Adoration of the Cross, which appear in the edition of the *Preces* of Damiani (XXII-XXIV), are to be found in this same *Ordo romanus antiquus*.[17] Were they added to Damiani's authentic prayers by a later hand, or, as M. Andrieu remarks: . . . *est-ce S. Pierre Damien qui avait lui-même puisé dans l'Ordo romanus antiquus?—Je ne saurais pousser si loin les précisions.*[18] Now among the unpublished pieces in the Mainz pontifical, which was known in Italy from Ottonian times, appears an *Expositio octo vestium Aaron primi pontificis*, followed by three *Sermons* on the same subject of liturgical vestments.[19] If any of these pieces proved upon examination to reproduce substantial parts of Pseudo-Alcuin as does the *Ordo romanus antiquus*, they would certainly invite comparison with Damiani's chapter to determine whether or not the material from Pseudo-Alcuin, as well as the three prayers for the Adoration of the Cross, could have come to Damiani through the medium of *Le pontifical romano-germanique du X^e siècle.*

---

[14] *Opusc.* XI, c. 17: Quid enim tota illa tabernaculi compositio (245D), is reminiscent of material from Bede, *De tabernaculo;* and: quid numerus levitarum (*ibid.*) may well refer to Rabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione* I, c. 7: *De diaconis* (PL 107, 303).

[15] H. de Lubac, '"Typologie" et "Allégorisme"', *Recherches de science religieuse*, XXXIV (1947), 190, comments: P. Damien s'écartera un peu de la typologie proprement dite lorsqu'il verra dans les rites de l'Eglise aussi bien que dans les faits des deux Testaments 'arcanum allegoricae theoriae sacramentum.'

[16] M. Andrieu, 'L'*Ordo romanus antiquus* et le *Liber de divinis officiis* du Pseudo-Alcuin', *Revue des sciences religieuses*, V (1925), 642 ff.

[17] A. Wlmart, 'Les prières de S. Pierre Damien pour l'adoration de la croix', *Rev. des sciences religieuses*, IX (1929), 517 ff.

[18] M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani du haut moyen age* I: *Les manuscrits* (Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, études et documents, XI, Louvain, 1931), p. 524.

[19] M. Andrieu, *op. cit.*, p. 196 (*Ms* Monte Cassino 451, fol. 73^{v} ff.); and p. 45 (*Ms* Bamberg. Lit. 53, fol. 56^{r} ff.).

On the other hand, if Pseudo-Alcuin is to be numbered among the commentators who were used by Damiani, then the fact itself that he used his work is as noteworthy as what he borrowed from it. The *Liber de divinis officiis* is frequently cited as a witness of some value for liturgical praxis at a time when witnesses are not numerous.[20] Its own history remains obscure.[21] It will undoubtedly be clarified by a study of the manuscripts, which Dom Wilmart deemed they deserved,[22] and by such other traces of its later use as may subsequently be brought to light.

J. JOSEPH RYAN
St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

---

[20] Cf., e. g., L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch* II (1933): *Personenregister, s.v.* Pseudo-Alkuin. On the dearth of writers for this period A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg i. Br., 1902), p. 407, comments: Nach der reichen Entwicklung der liturgischen Literatur in der Karolingerzeit nimmt sich das 10. Jahrhundert ärmlich aus. Die einzigen auf uns gekommenen Leistungen sind die Pseudo-Alkuinsche Schrift 'De divin. off.' u. eine für Schulzwecke bestimmte Messerklärung.

[21] The author's reference to his homeland as *Gallia Braccata* in c. 38 (PL 101, 1240A) is not clear. M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani* I. p. 546, places him among the commentators on the liturgical praxis of the Rhenish regions with Amalarius, Rabanus M., and Walafrid Strabo. A. Wilmart *DACL* V, 1 (1922), 1027, considers it not improbable that the compilation belongs to the school of Auxerre.

[22] A. Wilmart, *loc. cit.*

Boethius' *De Consolatione* by Jean de Meun

V. L. DEDECK-HÉRY

THROUGH the generosity of Mme. L. V. Dedeck-Héry, the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies is privileged to publish her late husband's unpublished text of Jean de Meun's translation of Boethius' De Consolatione philosophiae. *Just prior to his sudden and tragic death on the 27th of December, 1945, Professor Louis Venceslas Dedeck-Héry had completed his critical edition of the text and was in the process of writing an introduction to it. The typed manuscript of the text and variants, together with the hand-written material of the introduction—morphological, semantic and syntactical in character—were presented to the Pontifical Institute by his widow. Thus it is that* Mediaeval Studies *is able to make available to scholars and students of Old French literature and language and to Chaucerians in general the fruit of twelve years of zealous, unremitting and painstaking study and work. My task has consisted simply in preparing the manuscript for the press and in seeing it through to its final form. It has been an honor to associate myself with the late Professor Dedeck-Héry in this capacity and to share with him, however humbly, the distinction of making public so important a contribution to mediaeval letters.*

Born in Prague August 25th, 1883, Louis Venceslas Dedeck-Héry was graduated from the Gymnasium of that city in 1902 and from its University in 1908. Between 1905 and 1914 he taught Latin, Greek and French at the Gymnasium of his native city and later in Caslav. After spending several summers of study in Paris, he established himself there permanently in 1914 and until 1923 followed courses at the Sorbonne, the Ecole des Hautes Etudes and the Collège de France, devoting himself mainly to mediaeval French literature and philology under such masters as Joseph Bédier, Antoine Thomas, Alfred Jeanroy and Ferdinand Brunot. He came to America in 1923, entered the graduate school of the University of Pennsylvania and two years later obtained his Doctorate there.

On his arrival in Philadelphia in 1923, Professor Dedeck-Héry accepted a position at the Central High School of that city. He remained there until 1928 when he left to become Professor of Latin, French and German at the College of Saint Theresa at Winona, Minnesota. Three years later, he joined the faculty of the College of the City of New York. He was made Assistant Professor of Romance Languages in 1940, a position that he held when his brilliant career was cut short by a fatal heart attack on December 27th, 1945.

It was never my privilege to know Professor Dedeck-Héry except professionally as the author of a brilliant thesis: Li hystore de Julius Cesar de Jehan de Tuim, *as the editor of a critical and definitive edition of* La vie de Saint Alexis *and as a contributor of learned articles to* Speculum, PMLA, *the* Romanic Review *and several French periodicals. The charm of his personality, the solidity of his character, his competency as a teacher, the proficiency of his patient and conscientious scholarship, the greatness of the Christian virtues that were the admiration of his associates and intimates are well set forth in a tribute to his memory by Dr. Gaston Gille, a colleague at the City College of New York.*[1]

In an article written in 1940,[2] *Professor Dedeck-Héry enumerated, described and classified the seventeen manuscripts of Jean de Meun's translation. There he justified his choice of* Ms Paris, *BN,* fr. *1097 as the basis of his critical edition as*

---

[1] *The French Review*, XIX (1946), 466-7. Cf. also John L. Haney, 'A Tribute to a Scholar', *The Mirror*, XCV (1947), 31-2.

[2] 'The Manuscripts of Translation of Boethius' *Consolatio* by Jean de Meung', *Speculum*, XV (1940), 432-43.

being a prior text and closest, in his judgment, to the original.[3] *The variants, fully given from the other sixteen manuscripts, make the critical apparatus more bulky than is ordinarily the case for editions of Old French texts. The editor deliberately included all variants, however minute, to provide the machinery for one day determining the definite Latin manuscript and French commentary that Chaucer used in his translation. Professor Dedeck-Héry indicated the path that is to be followed in that connection in a further article in 1944.*[4] *He was working his way purposefully along that path when an untimely death struck him down the following year.*

The basic manuscript then of this edition is P^1 (Ms *Paris, BN,* fr. *1097). Clerical errors, mistakes in readings, elisions and omissions, are corrected by the twin of the basic manuscript* C^2 (Ms *Chantilly 284), the fragmentary* F^1 *(Paris, BN,* Lat. *8654B) and, when these fail, by the other members of group* a. *Within the body of variants, corrections of the basic* P^1 *are derived from these, and when these fail, from other manuscripts indicated in parentheses. Within the text in italics are printed words, phrases and sentences that have no corresponding Latin equivalent in the original. In general these are tautological in character, doublets to reinforce or explain the meaning, explanatory notes and glosses. References from the text are not indicated. These have been sufficiently indicated in editions of the Latin text and are sufficiently well known to warrant their omission. In editing, the following generally accepted rules for the edition of prose texts in Old French have been followed: no trema is used; in polysyllables, final* e *and* es *are atonic unless accented, any final consonant other than* s *implies in general that the preceding* e *is tonic; in the case of monosyllables, when* e *is final it is presumed to be atonic and is unaccented unless tonic, if followed by* s *it is not accented.*

ALEX. J. DENOMY C.S.B.

PONTIFICAL INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES

THE MANUSCRIPTS[5]

1. P^1 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 1097, fourteenth century. French text only. 44 folios.
2. P^2 Paris, B.N., *Lat.* 18424, fols. 1-166, formerly of Notre-Dame, fourteenth

---

[3] Manuscripts A^3 and P^4 have to be discarded since they occupy a special place: they only concern the metres. Moreover they are very poor. B and R are also very poor, they suffered considerably by their association with A^3 P^4. Besides they seem to give, according to what we said above, the priority to P^1 C^2. So does F^3. Ms C^1 is too inconstant, one might say that it floats between the two branches. F^1 which is the oldest and contains hardly any errors, would be quite appropriate for our purpose. Unfortunately it gives only a small portion of the text. There remains only Ms P^1 (and C^2, its twin). Although copied by a mediocre scribe, it however does not show such carelessness as Mss B and R. If P^1 is not always superior to the other Mss, it certainly avers its priority. The remarks on the succession of the Mss demonstrated that P^1 permits us to deduce the original more easily than the others. Certain glosses, embodied into the text in P^1 without logical connection while in the other Mss they are already transformed and adapted to the text, give evidence of it. If once P^1 is disencumbered of its clerical errors with the help of the fragmentary F^1 or, for want of the latter's completeness, with the help of the other members of its group, we shall then be able to establish a good text as close to the original as possible. *Art. cit.*, 443.

[4] 'Le Boèce de Chaucer et les manuscrits français de *la Consolatio* de J. Meun', *PMLA*, LIX (1944), 18-25.

[5] Reprinted from *Speculum*, XV (1940), 432-3, with the gracious permission of Dr. Charles R. D. Miller, Editor.

MANUSCRIPTS:

P^1 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 1097.
P^2 Paris, B.N., *Lat.* 18424.
P^3 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 1098.
P^4 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 809.
F^1 Paris, B.N., *Lat.* 8654B.
A^1 Paris, Arsenal, 732.
A^2 Paris, Arsenal, 733.
A^3 Paris, Arsenal, 2669.
B Besançon, 434.
C^1 Chantilly, 283.
C^2 Chantilly, 284.
F^2 Dijon, 525.
D Donai, 765.
R Rennes, 593.
S St. Omer, 661.
M New York, Morgan Library, 332.
F^3 Oxford, Bodleian, *Rawl.* G41.

a=$P^1C^1C^2BR$ or $P^1C^1C^2BRF^1$ or $P^1C^1C^2$-BRF^3 or again $P^1C^1C^2BRF^1F^3$.

b=$P^2DSP^3A^1A^2M$ or $P^2DSF^2P^3A^1A^2M$.

century. Latin text, translation and Trivet's commentary.

3. P^3 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 1098, first half of fifteenth century. Budé's copy. Latin text, translation and commentary. 116 folios.
4. P^4 Paris, B.N., *Fr.* 809, fols. 27-96, fifteenth century. Glossed; the numerous glosses are sometimes indicated in red, but are generally commingled with the text without any indication.
5. F^1 Paris, B.N., *Lat.* 8654B, fol. 48 (fragment), end of the thirteenth century or early fourteenth. French text only.
6. A^1 Paris, Arsenal 732, fourteenth century. From the library of M. Paulmy. Text and translation with Latin commentary. Parchment, 159 leaves and fol. A. 227.
7. A^2 Paris, Arsenal 733, fifteenth century. From the library of Grands-Augustins of Paris. Latin text and translation on the opposite page with a Latin commentary. Parchment, 161 folios.
8. A^3 Paris, Arsenal 2669, fifteenth century. Ex dono Guerin. Paper, 99 leaves and fol. A. 287; traces of clasps. Translation only. Incomplete.
9. B Besançon 434 (collection), fols. 293-338, fourteenth century (1372). French text only. Collection made for the King of France, Charles V.
10. C^1 Chantilly 283 (658), fourteenth century. Arms and monogram of Antoine Chourses and Catherine Coëtivy. On vellum, 37 leaves. French text only.
11. C^2 Chantilly 284 (627), fourteenth century (script somewhat more modern than in the preceding). The same arms. Vellum, 36 leaves. French only.
12. F^2 Dijon 525 (collection), fols. 201 (anc. paging 230)-221 (anc. 252); copied in Paris from 1358 to 1362. Parchment, 221 leaves. Up to metre II of book v, translation belongs to group II (without preface); from prose III of book v J. de Meung's translation (fol. 217, anc. pag. 248, to the end). French text only.
13. D Douai 765, fols. 20-115, fourteenth century. One can read in fol. 1 the following note written by the librarian of Marchiennes, Dom Charles Godin: "Apporté par l'abbé Chrétien au XIVe siècle." Parchment. Latin text and translation, no commentary.
14. R. Rennes 593 (collection), fols. 471-509, early fourteenth century (date indicated on p. 1: 1303). Parchment, 538 leaves of 3 columns; leather clasps. French text only.
15. S St. Omer 661 (collection), fols. 1-68, fifteenth century. Abbey of Saint-Bertin. Paper. Latin text, and translation on the opposite page.
16. M New York, Morgan Library 332, fifteenth century. Arms of Antoine, called the Grand Bâtard de Bourgogne with the device "Nul ne s'i frotte." Vellum, 161 folios. A Latin text "cum commento et expositione Sti Thome de Aquino" accompanies the translation.
17. F^3 Oxford, Bodl. *Rawl.* G41, fols 1-13. The Latin text and the commentary are of the twelfth century; the French version interpolated later, is used as an additional commentary.

Li Livres de Confort de Philosophie

[PREFACE]

A TA royal majesté, tres noble prince, par la grace de Dieu roy des François, Phelippe le Quart, je Jehan de Meun qui jadis ou Rommant de la Rose, puis que Jalousie ot mis en prison Bel Acueil, enseignai la maniere du chastel prendre et de la rose cueillir et translatay de latin en françois le livre Vegece de Chevalerie et le livre des Merveilles de Hyrlande et la Vie et les Epistres Pierres Abaelart et Heloys sa fame et le livre Aered de Esperituelle Amitié, envoie ore Boece de Consolacion que j'ai translaté de latin en françois. Ja soit ce que tu entendes bien le latin, mais toutevois est de moult plus legiers a entendre le françois que le latin. Et por ce que tu me deis—lequel dit je tieng pour commandement—que je preisse plainement la sentence de l'aucteur sens trop ensuivre les paroles du latin, je l'ai fait a mon petit pooir si comme ta debonnaireté le me commanda. Or pri touz ceulz qui cest livre verront, s'il leur semble en aucuns lieus que je me soie trop eslongniés des paroles de l'aucteur ou que je aie mis aucunes fois plus de paroles que li aucteur n'i met ou aucune fois mains, que il le me pardoingnent. Car se je eusse espons mot a mot le latin par le françois, li livres en fust trop occurs aus gens lais et li clers, neis moiennement letré, ne peussent pas legierement entendre le latin par le françois.

Et si comme dit li philosophes ou premier livre de Politiques, (1*rb*) toutez chosez tendent a bien. Et ce n'est pas prouvé tant seulement par l'auctorité du philosophe, mais par raison et par experiment apparant. Or di je ce par raison, car comme touz naturex desiriers se port en son semblable, si comme en son sauvement et en sa perfection, et fuie son contraire, si comme son corrumpement et sa destruction, il s'ensuit que, comme toutez les chosez qui sont soient bonnes, que toutez chosez desirent ce meismes qui est biens, si comme leur perfection ou le sauvement de leur perfection, et fuient son contraire, si comme chose descordant et nuisable. Et ce meismes veons nous apertement et par experiment es chosez vivans et par une semblance trouverons nous ce meismes en toutez les chosez qui sont. Car se une herbe ou un arbre est plantés entre deus terres, dont l'une soit grasse et bonne et l'autre meigre et mauvaise, nous trouverons que il metront toutez leurs racines en la bonne terre et fuiront tant comme il porront la terre mauvaise. Nous veons neis les petis arbres nessans desouz les grands que il se enclinent a la clarté du soleil si comme a bien, car li soleil est peres des plantes, si comme il est escrit ou livre des Plantes, et fuient l'ombre comme chose nuisant. Es bestes veons nous ce meismes: que par bien que on leur fait, s'aprivaisent les sauvages bestes et

---

1-2 des François: A^3P^4 de France.
5 Hyrlande: DSR Illande B Islande.
6 la Vie: $P^2P^3A^1A^2C^1C^2$ le livre; Abaelart: $P^3A^1A^2M$ Abailart P^2 Abaielart D Abeielart S Abayellart A^3 Abaalart RC^1 Aboielart; Aered: $P^3A^1A^2MP^2SC^1$ Aelred D Aelret R Aelered B Aelaret A^3P^4 Clarot.
7 Esperituelle: $P^2DSA^1A^2M$ espirituel; j'ai: $bBRC^1$ je te ai.
8 le latin: $P^1C^2RA^3$ latin.
9 de moult: bBR moult.
11 plainement: R plenierement.
12 je l'ai: P^1 j'ai.
13 s'il: P^1C^2R si.
14 ou que je: $P^1C^1C^2B$ ou je.
15 de: P^1 des.
15-6 il le me: P^1C^2 il me.
16 espons: R espont A^3 respont $P^4P^3A^1A^2$ expose.
17 en fust: P^3 eust este; lais: $P^2DA^1A^2$ laies; moiennement: $P^1C^2BRA^3P^4$ meismement S *lacuna*.
19 premier livre: P^1 *inverted* $P^2A^1A^2M$ premier.
21 experiment apparant: b experimens.
26 son: bBC^1 leur.
28 et par experiment (F^1): P^1C^2 *om.* b par experimens (P^2 *after* veons nous).
29 et par une: P^1 par bonne C^2 et par bonne.
33 terre: bC^1 *om.*; les: b $C^1C^2F^1$ des.
34 nessans: DS qui croissent; clarté: BRP^4A^3 chaleur.
35 plantes: A^3P^4 planettes.
35-6 si . . . Plantes $A^3P^3P^4$ *om.*
37 que: bF^1C^1R car MB et.

par le mal qu'on leur fait, les bestes privees s'en assauvagissent. Ou lignage neis humain est ce meismes tout apert, car par benefices entrechangiéz aime li uns l'autre et le suit, et par les maulz et par les tors que il s'entrefont, (1*va*) fuient li un les autres et toutez leurs amitiés et les compaignies en sont depeciees. Es autres chosez neis qui sont peut l'en aussi ce meismes veoir, car en toutez est nee inclinacion qu'elles se meuvent a bien, si comme il apert es elemens qui par leurs natureles proprietés se meuvent a leur propre lieu comme a leur sauvement, et fuient estrange lieu comme corrupcion. Dont il apert que toutez les chosez qui sont tendent a bien.

Mais toutevois ja soit ce que il soit ainsi, li lignages humains en ce se descorde molt des autres chosez qui sont, car les autres chosez qui sont requierent determineement et sens erreur et ensuivent leur bien. Mais hom sens determinance, par confusion et sens ordre, se meut et queurt a son bien. Car divers hommes se meuvent et adrecent leurs euvres a divers biens dom l'erreur humaine et li defaus de leur perfection est ici touz apers. Dont entre les autres chosez qui sont, seus homme a mestier de usage pour prestement ouvrer, et de doctrine pour sagement eslire a ce que il se meuve droitement et sens erreur a son propre bien. Et certainement la cause de ceste erreur et de ceste faute de perfection vient de ce que li biens de homme est biens entendibles, a la cognoissance du quel hom vient premierement par sens, et pour ce que li biens sensible sont maint et divers, il delesse legierement son propre bien et eslit le bien estrange, et cuide que ce qui est bon selonc aucune chose soit bon simplement, et juige que ce soit propre (1*vb*) qui est commun, et que ce soit bon par soy qui est bon par accident en nature. Car lonc temps est homs norris es sensibles biens avant que il soit eslevéz a la cognoissance des biens entendibles. Par quoy il convient que il soit menés par doctrine et par mainte experience a ce que il viegne a la discrecion et au devisement des biens et que dejouste les biens apparans et non parfait il sache eslire le bien vray, souverain et parfait. Et quand il sera parvenus a ce, il se esjoira et se delitera es chosez ou il se doit deliter et esjoir et ne se courrosera pas ne ne se deudra des chosez dont raison ne diroit pas que il s'en deust douloir. Et pour ce que li pluseurs des hommes defaillent en ce—ne nous ne les veons pas venir a ceste discrecion—avient il souvent que il se deulent des chosez dont il se deussent par raison esjoir et aussi, du contraire, que il se esjoissent de ce de quoy raison se deult. Dom la vie de telz gens est arrousee et raemplie de maintes amertumes. Car il sont demenés et deboutéz par les biens sensibles es quiex nule chose n'est joieuse sens tristece n'il ne demeurent pas

---

38 privees: P^1C^2 *om.*
40 et le suit: A^3P^4 s'entrefuient *DS om.*; tors: P^2DS torfais.
42 neis: P^1C^2 neis aussi.
43 se meuvent: P^1C^2 s'esmeuvent *R* se mainnent A^3 s'esmement.
44-5 se meuvent: P^1C^2B s'esmeuvent C^1 se mainent *R* se meinnent.
48 en ce: *after* molt *in bBR.*
49 chosez: P^1C^2 *om.*; des autres ch. qui sont: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
50 requierent: A^3P^4 requiert leur bien.
51 se meut et queurt: *B* se esmuet a venir A^3P^4 s'ensuivent a venir.
52 se meuvent: P^1C^2B s'esmeuvent *R* si mainent A^3P^4 s'esforcent
53-4 touz apers: $P^3A^1A^2M$ bien apparant; les autres chosez: *b* toutes les ch.
54-5 de usage: A^3P^4 du saige.
56 se meuve: P^1B se meuvent $C^1RA^3P^4$ se maine.
57 ceste err.: *b* (*except M*) celle err.; faute: P^1C^2B defaute.
58 entendibles: *b* (*except M*) F^1C^1BR entendables A^3P^3 entendible.
61 cuide: A^3P^4 delaissent (delaissent ce qui est bon selon auc. ch. et jugent); est bon: P^1C^2 est bien; cuide . . . simplement: P^4 delaissent ce qui est bon simplement pour ce qui est bon selon auc. ch.; simplement: C^1R simple.
63 en: A^3P^4 de.
66 mainte: A^3P^4 droite.
68 parvenus: *b* venus A^3P^4 pourveu.
69 deudra: C^2M deuldra BRP^3A^1 douldra F^1 doura P^2A^2 dieudra *S* deurra *D* diurra C^1 daura A^3P^4 *om.*
70 raison: P^3 nuls homs; s'en: $P^1C^2A^1$ se.
73 aussi: P^1B ainsi *R* ainssint C^2 ainssin C^1 ensi:
74 de quoy: DSA^3P^4 dont; arrousee et raemplie: *DS inverted.*
75 maintes: *DS* pluiseurs.

touz jours uns, meismes comme leur bonté soit continuelment en mouvement. A telz gens est doncques profitable la translacion de cest livre et meismement a ceulz qui n'entendent pas le langage des Latins. Et ja soit ce que Boeces l'eust fait en confort de soy meismes, toutevois les chosez qui dedens sont desputees enseignent apertement comme chascun hom peut avoir discrecion et cognoissance de la diversité des biens et as quiex biens li hom- (*2ra*) me doivent adrecier leurs cuers et leurs pensees et se li autre bien viennent habondamment aus hommes, cist livre enseigne comment on doit user de ces biens. Dom cist livre n'est pas de petit profit, mais de tres grant, car entre touz les livres qui oncques furent fais, cist est souverains a despire les biens vilz et decevables qui demonstrent le signe de la fausse beneurté et a eslire les biens pardurables qui nous adrecent et enforment a la vraie beneurté.

Cist Boeces ama moult le commun profit et fu haiz de Theodoric qui lors estoit roy des Romains. Dom comme cil Theodoric en guise de tyrant fist plusieurs crualtéz contre le profit du pueple et touz jours trouvast Boece contraire a ces felons establissemens, il, par sa grant felonnie esmeus, estudia a trouver cause par quoy il peust Boece destruire. Et comme il ne peust a ce cause trouver, il faint que li empereur de Constentinnoble avoit envoié letres a Boece es queles il estoit contenu que li empereur escrivoit a Boece que il ert prest de aidier aus Romains en toutez chosez contre les crualtéz Theodoric. Dont li felons roys, faingnans par ces letres achoison de traison contre Boece qui de ce riens ne savoit, fist que Boece, innocent et non sachant, sens estre presens fu juigiéz et envoiéz en essil et fu mis en chartre en la cité de Pavie. Et ainsi, par vice mauvaisement faint, sueffre tourment vraie vertu. Mais pour ce que cil qui est vraiement bons, si comme dit li philosophes ou premier livre de Eti- (*2rb*) ques, il souffrera toutez fortunes tres bien et du tout sagement, cist Boeces qui tous jours avoit esté bons fist illeuc en la chartre cest livre qui est intitulé Boece de Confort de Philosophie ou quel il demonstre que il sueffre tres bien et du tout sagement sa douleur comme homme fort et de grant cuer avecques tout ce que il sentoit la grant mescheance, si comme il apert en sa maniere de parler.

Or est donques bon de ramener a memoire ce que nous avons touchié et dit ci dessus, ce est assavoir que homme premierement et par moult de

---

77 continuelment en mouvement: *b* tous jours en mouv. continuelment C^1R continuelment mouvable et en mouv.
81 desputees: P^1BP^4 deputees A^3 depputez A^1MP^3 disputees; comme: *bBRC*^{1} comment; peut: A^3P^4 doit.
82 as quiex biens (*BR*): P^2DS a quels b. C^1 en quelx b. $P^3A^1A^2M$ aus q. b. A^3 aux quelz P^1C^2 a quel.
85 de (petit): P^1 *om.*
87 a despire: P^3 pour despriser.
88 biens: P^1C^2 *om.*; et a eslire . . . beneurté: C^1R *om.*
90 commun profit: A^3P^4 *inverted and followed by a long gloss.*
91 Romains: A^3P^4 *gloss follows;* en guise: P^3 a la maniere.
92 pluiseurs: *b* moult de.
93 contraire: C^1R contraire a ces felonnies et; sa: P^1C^2B *om.*
94 par quoy: $P^1C^2P^2M$ comment A^1A^2 comme; ne: P^1B *om.*
95 faint: C^1DS fainst *R* feinst P^4 faingni P^3 faignist A^3 faingnist *M* feigny; empereur: P^1C^2 emp. de Constantinnoble.
96-7 es queles . . . a Boece: P^3 *om.*
97 ert (C^1C^2): P^1B est *R* iert *b* estoit.
98 Dont: P^1C^2 dont ainsi; li felons roys: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 li roys; faingnans: BRA^3P^4 faignoit C^1 signoit; achoison (*BR*): P^1C^2 en maniere *all other manuscripts* occoison occasion.
100 non: *DS* nient; et envoiéz: P^1C^2 a envoier.
101 par: *D* sus RA^3P^4 sans (*B* Et ainsi sanz vice par vice); mauvaisement . . . sueffre: A^3 mauvaise faintise fait souffrir P^4 mauvaises fait faire souffrir aucune fois; faint: P^1 *om.*
104 du tout: A^3P^4 tres; tous jours: P^1 *corrupt.*
104-6 cist Boeces . . . sagement: BC^1 *om.*
105-6 de Confort: *bR* du C.
106 tres: *DS* trop.
107 douleur: *bBR* fortune C^1 *om.*; homme fort: C^2 *inverts b* fors.
108 tout: *b* *om.*; que: RC^1 *om.*; la grant mescheance: *bBR* la douleur de sa m.
109 de: C^1 du *b* de son; sa: *bC*^{1} la.
111-2 par moult de temps: C^1 *om.* *B* par moult; premierement . . . norris: *order according to bBR.*

temps est norris es biens sensibles forains et fortuniex, dont il apartient moult a homme sentir et doloir des mescheances qui li aviennent entour telz biens. Mais cil qui est ellevéz es biens entendibles seufre tres bien et sagement les fortunes de telz biens et trespasse en vie divine. Donc selonc ce est homme devisé en deuz, ce est a savoir en homme tourmenté et demené par passions sensibles et en homme devinement ellevé es biens entendibles. Et pour ce que seule philosophie nous ellieve par le don de dieu aus biens entendibles, Boeces establist et represente soi en partie de homme troublé et tourmenté et demené par passions sensibles et establist philosophie en partie de homme ellevé et ensuivant les biens entendibles. Si que en la partie de soy il demonstre ses douleurs et les causes qui ses douleurs esmeuvent, et en la partie de philosophie il amene les causes qui aneantissent ses douleurs et demonstre (2*va*) le confort qui l'oste de ses douleurs. Et por ce est apeléz cist livres Li Livres de Confort de Philosophie. Si que deuz personnes sont ici senefiees, c'est a savoir li malades et li mires, car douleur et troublement de cuer pour biens temporex sont en homme de faible et de enferme pensee, mais soy conforter et constreter a telz douleurs ce apartient a homme de noble et de parfait entendement.

Et commence Boece son livre dolereusement comme il afiert a homme qui represente ses douleurs, si comme il apert aus liseeurs.

[BOOK I.]

[METRE I.]

Halas! Je, qui jadis parfis jolies chançonnetez en mon estude flurissant, sui maintenant contraint a commencier en plourant a faire vers de dolereuse matiere. Veéz ci que les desordenees Muses des poetes me ditent chosez a escrire et mi chetif ver arrousent mon visage des vrais pleurs. Toutevois ne pot nule pour icestes parvaincre que elles ne me fussent compaignes et poursuissent notre airre. Cestes qui jadis furent la gloire de ma jeunece beneuree et vert confortent maintenant les destinees de moy dolereus viellart, car viellece m'est venue plus tost que je ne cuidoie, hastee par mes maulz, et douleur a commendé que ses aages me soit venuz. Chennes sont espandues par ma teste avant leur temps et tremble li lache cuirs en mon corps affoibli. Beneuree est la mort des hommes qui ne s'embat pas

---

114 tres bien et: P^1C^2 *om.* A^1 tres bien A^3 bien et B tres.
115 vie divine: A^3P^4 medicine.
117 et en homme: C^1R *om.*
118 don: $P^2A^1A^2M$ bien R dom.
118-9 Et pour ce . . . entendibles: P^2DS *om.*
119 Boeces: P^1 cist B. C^2 cil Boec. P^4 l'aucteur B Boece tout corroucie.
120 et demené: BR ou dem.; establist: P^3 ordonne.
122-3 causes . . . amene: P^2DS *om.*
123 amene: $P^3A^1A^2M$ enduit et amene.
124 aneantissent: DS amenuissent BA^3P^4 atisent R enticent C^1 enquierent.
124-5 et demonstre . . . douleurs: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
126 senefiees: RA^3P^4 figurees.
126-7 li malades et: P^1C^2 *om.*
127 pour: P^1C^2 des $C^1RA^3P^4$ pour les.
128 soy: P^1 en soy.
129 a: P^1C^2 en; noble: A^3P^4 fort; de (parfait): P^1 *om.*
131 et commence: P^1C^2 et pour ce com.; comme: bB si comme; afiert: A^3P^4 appartient; homme: A^3P^4 hom. de entendement.
132 si comme: A^3P^4R et si com. DS ensi que; liseeurs: *followed by a gloss in* A^3P^4.

METRE I.

1 je qui: A^3P^4 *om.*; parfis: F^1 fis; jolies ($P^1F^3BA^1A^3P^4$): $bC^1C^2F^1R$ jolives.
3 Veéz ci: F^1BR vez ci A^1A^2 vesci D veschi S vechi F^3 veci M vecy; desordenees: P^2 ordenees A^3 ordonnez.
4 mi: $P^3A^1A^2M$ mes A^3P^4 ung; ver: P^2A^1-A^2M vers.
6 poursuissent (C^2B, etc.): P^1 pourssuissent C^4R poursiuissent P^2 -siv- DS -siev- F^3 -seu- M -suiv- F^1 -sius- A^2 poursussent; airre: P^2D oirre S oerre $BRC^1F^3P^3A^1A^2M$ erre; cestes: P^1 certes cil C^2 certes ceulz; furent: P^1C^2 firent.
7 et vert confortent: C^1 est et reconfortent A^3 et bien confortant.
9 ses: A^3S cest P^4 ceste P^3B son; chennes ($P^1C^2F^1$): P^2 chiennes $BF^3P^3A^1A^2$ chanes R channes DSM chaines C^1 caines A^3 chesnes.
10 cuirs: P^1BRS cuers A^3 *om.* (A^3: et tremble et les lasches en mon corps affoiblist).

es doulz ans, ains vient aus dolereus apelee souvent. Helas! Helas! comme elle destorne de soy les chetis (2*vb*) a sourde oreille et est si crueuse que elle refuse a clorre les yeux plourans. Quant fortune malfiable m'otroioit sa grace en ses biens legiers et fuitis, par pou que une dolereuse heure ne mi fist mon chief plungier *et naier*. Orendroit pour ce que ele, oscure, a mué son decevable voult, ma felonnesse vie m'aloigne la desagreable demeure *de mort*. O vous, mi ami, pour quoi deistes vous tant de fois en vantant que je estoie beneuréz? Cil qui est cheus n'estoit pas en estable degré.

[PROSE I.]

En dementiers que je, tesibles, recordoie ces chosez a moi meismes et senefiaie ma plorable complainte par office de greffe, je vi sus mon chief ester une fame de moult redoutable voult. Yeux avoit ardans et regardables oultre la commune puissance des hommes; vive couleur ot et vigueur que nulz ne pot oncques espuisier, ja soit ce que elle fust plaine de si grant aage que on ne creoit en nule maniere que ele fust de notre temps. L'estature de li estoit de douteus jugement, car elle s'apetiçoit aucune fois jusques a la commune mesure des hommes et aucune fois sembloit que elle hurtast le ciel par la longuesce de sa tres haute teste; et quant elle levoit plus haut son chief, elle perçoit neis le ciel meismes et decevoit la veue des hommes regardans. Ses robes estoient de tres deliéz filz et de soutille ourvaingne, de matiere pardurable parfetes, les queles ele avoit tissues de ses mains, si comme je cognu aprés par li meismes demonstrant *et recognoissant;* la biauté des queles une occurté de ancienneté despite avoit occurcie, si comme elle seult *occurcir* les images en- (3*ra*) fumees. Ou derrenier oule de ces robes *et ou plus bas* lisoit l'en tissue une letre grezesche, *tele* Π *qui senefioit la vie active,* et *pardesus* ou plus haut oule *une autre letre, tele* Θ *qui senefioit la vie contemplative.* Et entre ces deuz letres estoient veus illeuc unz degrés fais a maniere de eschieles par lesquiex l'en peust monter de la plus basse letre a la plus haute. Et

---

12 ains: bC^1F^1 et A^3 mes; aus dolereus: C^1 en doleureuse.

13 est si: A^2 ainsi A^1P^3 en si; crueuse: F^1 cruieuse P^1C^2M cruele.

14 m'otroioit (P^1F^1): C^2 me octroiet BF^3 me moustra (*superscript*: fu favorable) *b* me moustroit C^1R moustre a gent A^3 moustre aux gens P^4 moustra aux gens.

15 grace: A^3P^4 g. en moi; en: P^1C^2 ou A^3P^4 do.

16 mi ($P^1F^1C^1RA^3$): bC^2F^3B me; orendroit: A^3 or des maintenant; a: A^3P^4 *om.*

17 m'aloigne ($P^1C^1C^2F^3RP^2P^4A^1$): F^1 aloigne *M* alongne *DS* m'alonge A^3 ma longue P^3 esloigne.

17-8 la desagreable demeure ($P^1C^2F^3$): BRA^3 desagreable d. P^4 de sa desagreable d. P^3 desagreables demeures F^1C^1 des agreables d. *b* (*except* P^3) par desagreables demeures.

18-9 en vantant: *b* *om.*

19 est cheus: P^1C^2 encheus.

PROSE I.

1 a moi meismes: P^1C^2 *om.*

2 greffe: P^1C^2 grace.

3 redoutable: F^3 doutable; regardables: *b* regardans.

5 oncques: *b* *om.*

6 creoit (P^1R): $BP^3A^1A^2$ creroit C^1C^2DSM croiroit F^3 croirrot.

7 de li: BRA^1A^2 de lui P^1P^3M de elle; jugement: P^1 jugemens; s'apetiçoit: F^3S s'apetissoit *D* s'apetichoit C^2 se apetissoit *B* se apetisoit C^1 sa petisoit *R* sa tapisoit P^3M se monstroit A^1 se demonstroit s'apeticoit.

8 sembloit: F^3 semblot.

9 longuesce (C^2RP^2): *B* largesce *b* (*except* P^2) longuesse F^3 longece C^1 laguece P^1 longuese.

10 perçoit: P^1 per soit.

12 ourvaingne: C^2R ouvraingne P^2 ouvraigne *b* (*except* P^2) BF^3 ouvrage C^1 ouurage; soutille (P^1C^2R): bBC^1F^3 soutil (*and* soubtil); queles: *BR* quiex.

13-4 demonstrant *et*: *b* *om.* C^1 recognissant demonstrant.

16 oule: $C^1P^2A^1A^2MD$ oulle *S* olle F^3RP^3 ourle; de ces (P^1F^3): C^1C^2BR de ses *b* des.

17 π: C^2b (*except* P^3) *om.*; grezesche: P^2A^1 grece C^1 gresce A^2MF^3 greesche P^3BD griesche *S* griesce *R* gregeiche.

17-8 vie . . . senefioit: P^2 *om.*

17 qui senefioit . . . pardessus: P^3 *om.* (P^3 *reads immediately after*: et ou haut une autre, tele Θ.

17-18 la vie active . . . senefioit: A^2 *om.*

18 qui . . . contemplative: P^3 *om.* A^1M: qui senefioit la vie contemplative et ou plus haut orle (A^1) une letre qui senefioit la vie active; *DS*: qui signifioit la vie contemplative et ou plus haut oule (*S*: liu en) avoit une qui signifioit la vie active; P^1=$C^1C^2BRF^3$ *Chaucer*.

19 illeuc: C^2 illec $bBRC^1F^3$ *om.* *Chaucer* there.

toutevois les mains d'aucunes gens avoient tranchié cele robe par force et par violence, et en avoient porté chascuns tele partie comme il pot. Elle portoit en sa main destre livres et en la senestre un çeptre.

Et quant elle vit les Muses des poetes estans entour notre lit et dictanz paroles a mes pleurs, elle en fu un petit esmeue et enfamblee de cruelz eulz et dist: "Qui a lessié aprochier a ce malade ces communes putereles abandonnees au peuple qui tant seulement ne li assouageront pas ses douleurs par quelques remedez, mais enseurquetout les li norriront de doulz veninz? Car ce sont celles qui par painturez de entalentemenz qui ne sont *profitables* ne fructueuses ocient le blé planteureuz des fruiz de raison et tiennent les pensees des hommes en coustume et ne les delivrent pas de maladie. Mais se vos blandices me fortreissent aucun homme rude *et non profitable,* si comme l'en le seult communement trouver *ou peuple,* je cuidasse que je le deusse souffrir mainz dolereusement; *ne ce n'est pas merveille,* car nos ententes ne fussent de riens blecees en celui. Mais vous me toléz cestui qui a esté norris es estudes eleatiques et academianz. Mais alés vous en anceiz, vous qui estes Sereines douces jus- (*3rb*) que a destruction, et le me laisséz a curer et a guerir avec mes sciences".

Cele compaignie *des Muses,* blasmee par ces chosez dites, geta plus courrouciee son voult a terre et monstranz sa vergoigne par roigeur passa triste le sueil de l'uis et ala hors. Mais je, de cui la veue plungiee en lermes estoit occurcie, ne ne peusse pas cognoistre qui fust ceste fame de si emperiable auctorité, m'esbahi et, mon regart en terre geté, commençai tesibles a atendre que elle feroit des ore en avant. Lors vint elle plus pres et se sist en la derreniere partie de mon lit et regardanz mon voult pesant *et grief* de pleur et par pleur en terre degeté, s'est complainte par ces vers de la perturbacion de notre pensee.

[METRE II.]

"Ha lasse! comme la pensee de cestui, plungiee en trebuichable parfondece, rebouche et, sa propre clarté delaissiee, tant a aler en foraines tenebres et sa nuisable cure, par quantes foiz demenee par les vens terriens, craist elle sens fin. Cist jadis delivrés, a cui li cielx iert ouvers *et cogneuz* et ert acoustuméz d'aler es celestieuz trespassamens, regardoit les lumieres du

---

22 tele partie ($P^1C^2BF^3$): C^1R tieus parties b tant; comme: P^2DS que; pot. Elle: R pouoit et le F^3 pouoit. Et si (F^3 *continues:* portoit la devant dite fame un livre en sa main dextre).

25 petit: P^2 poi P^3 peu A^1MS pou A^2 po D pau; enfamblee: $P^2A^1A^2R$, *etc.* enflambee DS enflabee.

27 assouageront: C^1 assouageroient $P^3A^1A^2M$ alegeront.

28 norriront: $P^1C^1F^3R$ norriroient B nourriront.

29 painturez de entalentemenz: P^3 pointures d'affections.

30 sont: bBC^1F^3 sont pas R sont mie; fructueuses: F^3 fructifieuses.

31 *a long lacuna in S*: et tiennent . . . esté (prose III, l. 4.).

32 fortreissent: $P^3A^1A^2M$ fortraissent BF^3 fortraisissent P^2 fortraissisissent C^1 fourtraisissent D fourt'isissent R fortresisissent.

33 le: bC^2BR *om.* C^1 les.

35 blecees: $P^2P^3A^1A^2F^3$ blecies C^1 blechies RM bleciees B blesciees; en celui: P^2D *om.* $P^3A^1A^2BR$ en celi (celli *or* celly) C^1 en ce.

36 cestui: P^2B cesti.

37 Sereines: M serenes $BRC^1A^1A^2D$ seraines P^2 saines F^3 se'nes P^3 femmes (*abbr.* fe'nes).

37-8 a destruction: P^1C^2 a la mort a destruction F^3 a la mort en quiex a destruction B a la mort et quel est destruction.

38 avec: b a BF^3 par.

39 dites: bC^1R *om.* B devant dites.

40 a: b en; par: P^1 *om.*

41 je de cui (R): b (*except* P^4) C^1BF^3 je de qui P^1 je cuit que C^2 je cuide que.

42 fust ceste fame: P^1C^2 ceste f. fust.

43 emperiable: D emperial B emperiale $P^3A^1A^2M$ imperieuse; m'esbahi: P^1 mais bahi; commençai: P^1 commensay A^1A^2 commence.

44 a atendre: P^1C^2 a entendre A^3 a antendre P^2D atendre.

45 se sist: D sasist C^1 sa sist $P^2P^3A^1A^2M$ s'assist.

46 *grief*: P^1 crief; degeté: C^1 degypte C^2 giete b gete.

METRE II.

1 en: A^1D est.

2 rebouche: $P^1C^1A^1$ et rebouche b (*except* A^1; M et *corrected to* est) C^2BF^3 est r. R et est r. D est reoingnie (*o corrected to b*).

4 sens: P^4RF^3 et sens; li cielx: R liseus; iert: P^2 ert $P^3P^4A^1A^2C^1B$ est D estoit; ert: F^3 iert B est b estoit.

5 lumieres: P^1P^2 luminaires; rouge soleil: P^1C^2 *inverted.*

rouge soleil et veoit les estoilles de la froide lune; il vainquierres avoit compris par nombres quelconque estoille, flechie par divers avironnemens, hante foloiables recours, et enseurquetout neis les causes dom *ce vient que* li vent sonnable esmeuvent les planices de la mer, et quelz esperiz tournoie le firmament estable, et pour quoy se lieve du rouge oriant l'estoille a choiair es undes de occident; et ert acoustuméz a encerchier quele chose atrempe les plaisans (*3va*) heurez de printens pour ce que il aorne la terre de fleurs vermeillez et blanches, et qui a donné que aoust plenteureus en plain an dequeurre des grapes grossez; et iert acoustuméz a rendre les diverses causes de nature reposte. Helas! or se gist, avuglee la clarté de sa pensee et son col chargié de chaenes pesans, et portanz son voult enclin pour le faiz est contrains a regarder la fole terre.

[PROSE II.]

Mes ore est", dist elle, "temps de medecine et non mie de complainte". Lors elle, entendanz en moy o touz les regars de ses yeulx, dist: "Ne es tu pas cil qui, jadis norris de notre let et peus de nos viandes, estoies eschapéz et venuz en courage de homme parfait? Certez, nous t'avions donné telz armes que, se tu ne les eusses premiers getees, elles te deffendissent par fermeté qui ne peust estre vaincue. Ne me cognois tu pas? Pour quoy te tes tu? Est ce pour honte ou pour paour? Je vaudroie miex pour honte mais, si comme il me semble, paour t'a surpris." Et comme elle m'eust veu non mie tant seulement tesibles, mais du tout sans langue et mu, elle ajousta souevement sa main a mon piz et dist: "Ci n'a point de peril; il est cheuz en letargie; c'est commune maladie de pensees deceues. Il s'est un petit oubliéz; legierement certes se racordera s'il nous a cogneu avant. Et pour ce que il le puisse, terdons li un petit ses yeux occurcissanz par la nublece des chosez mortiex." Ce dist elle et par sa robe pliee en fronce secha mes yeux ondoianz de pleurs.

[METRE III.]

Lors, la nuit chaciee, me laisserent tenebres et a mes yeux repaira leur (*3vb*) premeraine vigueur. Ainsi comme li souleuz se repont quant les estoilles sont envelopees *et couvertez* par Chorus qui est un vent ineaus et li airs s'est arrestéz ocurs par nues pleuieuses ne ne viennent pas ou

---

6 de la froide: P^4BF^3 del estrange.
7 compris: P^4 sourpris; nombres: bP^4BF^3 nombre; quelconque ($F^3P^3A^1A^2M$): $P^1C^2BRC^1P^2P^4D$ quelconques; par divers avironnemens: F^3 par d. mouvemens et a. *B* mouvemens et a.
8 hante foloiables recours: *B* du ciel et les retours de li.
8-9 *ce* . . . vent: BF^3 les vens; que li vent: A^3P^4R *om.*
9 sonnable ($P^1C^2RA^3P^4$): C^1 sonnaule BF^3 sonans *b* mouvable; esmeuvent: *b* meuvent A^3 esmouvemens P^4 esmovant; planices (bC^1R): A^3P^4 planetes P^1C^2 plaineites *D* plaines *B* ondes F^3 undes; tournoie ($P^1BRF^3C^1$): P^2 tournaie $C^2P^3A^1M$ tourne A^2 *corrupt* *D* tornoille.
11 choiair: C^2 choair $bBRF^3$ cheoir C^1D ceoir; ert acoustuméz (BF^3): P^1C^2 est coustumez bRP^4 acoustumez C^1 a coustumes; a: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
13 a donné que ($P^1C^1C^2RF^3A^3P^4$): *b* a donne de + *inf.* *B* fait.
13-4 aoust . . . grapes (C^1RF^3): P^1C^2 *om.* plenteureus A^3P^4 de cueillir *for* desqueure *B* aoust plenteureux de grain et octobre de grapes P^2D aoust plentereus de abunder de trapes (*D* crapes) $P^3A^1A^2M$ autompne plenteureus de habunder de grapes.
14 iert acoustuméz a: *added from* F^3.
15 se gist: *R* se geist *b* gist; avuglee la clarté (P^1C^2R): C^1 avulee la c. BF^3 avugle la c. P^4 avuglee clarte *b* avugle (D avules) de la c.
16 portanz: RF^3 portant A^2 portẽnt P^3A^1M pour tant.
17 fole: P^4 folie BF^3 *om.*

PROSE II.

2 en moy: $P^2P^3A^2BRF^3$ a m.; o: P^1 ou P^3 a.
5 se: P^1 ce.
9 mie: P^1 mis.
10 mon piz: P^3 ma poictrine.
12 cogneu: P^2 cogneue *DR* conneue.

METRE III.

1 repaira: F^3 repera *b* retorna.
2 premeraine: *b* premiere.
3 *et couvertez*: *b* *om.*; est: P^1 *om.*
4 pleuieuses: $C^2P^2P^3D$ pluvieuses $C^1RA^1A^2M$ pluieuses P^4 plungiees F^3 plongeuses *B* plungeus.
4-5 ou ciel les estoilles (P^1C^2): $bC^1BRF^3P^4$ les e. ou c.

ciel les estoilles et desus la terre est espandue la nuit—se bise mise hors de la fosse treicienne bat celle nuit et desqueuvre le jour clos, li soleuz raianz resplendist et fiert par soudaine lumiere les yeux merveillanz.

[PROSE III.]

Ainsi et non pas autrement les nubleces de tristece dissolues, je pris le ciel et reçui ma pensee a cognoistre la face de ma mirgece. Si que, puis que je oi mis mes yeulx en li et fiché mon regart, je regardé ma norrice es mesons de cui avoie esté conversanz de ma jeunesce, c'est a savoir Philosophie, et dis: "O tu mestresse de toutez vertuz, descendue du souverain cardinal, pour quoy es tu venue en ces solitaires lieus de notre essil? Es tu donques pour ce venue que tu soies ainsi demenee coupable avec moi des faus blasmes?" "O", dist elle, "tu li miens norri, te laisseroie je donques ne ne partiroie avecques toy, par commun travail, la charge que tu as soufferte par l'envie de mon nom? Certes, il n'estoit pas avenant *ne chose laissable* a philosophie laissier sans compaignie le chemin de toy innocent; redouteroie je doncques mon blasme et craindroie je ainsi comme se aucune chose nouvelle fust avenue? Car juges tu que philosophie soit ores premierement assaillie par perilz envers les meurs mauvés? Ne estrivasmes nous ainsi par grant estrif envers les anciens, neis devant l'aage de (4*ra*) nostre Platon, encontre le hardement de folie? Et puis que Platon fu remés vis, deservi, moi presente, Socrates ses maistres victoire de mort non mie droituriere? Du quel comme le peuple epicuriens et stoiciens et pluseur autre s'aparaillassent a aler ravir l'eritage, chascun pour sa partie, et detressissent, moi reclamant et efforçant encontre, ainsi comme en partie de praie il me depecierent ma robe que je avoie tissue de mes propres mains; et les girons arrachiéz, en cuidanz que je m'en alasse toute a euz, se departirent de moy. Et en yceus pour ce que aucunes traces de notre habit i apparoient, la folie des hommes cuidant que cil fussent mi familier, *deçut et* perverti pluseurs, par l'erreur de la fole multitude, de ceus. Mais se tu n'as pas cogneu la fuite de Anaxagoras ne le venim de Socrates ne les tourmens de Zenon pour ce que il sont estrange, au mains as tu peu savoir les Caniens et les Seneciens et Seranz dont la

---

5 mise (*b*): *a* mis.
6 treicienne (*b*): P^1C^2 tercianne C^1 trecienne F^3 traicienne P^4 traiciante *B* traciante *R* traissante.
7 merveillanz: P^1C^2 vermeillanz.
PROSE III.
2 mirgece: P^3 phisisienne.
2-3 Si . . . mis: BF^3 si que je mis.
3 et fiché: F^3 et y fichai *B* et fichai *D* et figuiet P^2R et fichie: regardé: P^2 etc. regardai.
4 de cui: *b* de la quele; de: P^3D des; jeunesce (C^2): P^1 jeunence *B* jennesce P^2P^3 jeunesse C^1 jonece F^3A^1 jonesce *S* jonesse *R* joensce A^2 jomeste *D* joulece *M* juenesse.
7 tu (soies): P^1 *om.*; ainsi: *b* aussi *R* aussint.
8 avec moi des faus blasmes (P^1C^2): bC^1-BRF^3 de f.b. avec moi: tu: *b* *om.*
8-9 te laisseroie je (F^3): C^1 te laisseroi je *B* te laisserai je *b* te leroie (lairoie) je C^2 comment te laisseroie *R* com te lesseroie je P^1 comment laisseroie.
10 soufferte: P^1C^2 souffert.
11 *laissable*: P^1 li sable C^2 lisable; sans compaignie: *b* *om.*
13 juges: F^3 crois.
14 ores: *b* *om.*; assaillie: *b* *om.*; meurs mauvés: *b* mauvaises m.
15 nous: *b* nous pas; ainsi: *R* ainssint $BF^3C^1P^2D$ aussi *b* (*except* P^2D) *om.*; envers les: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ou temps des.
16 de nostre: *b* *om.*; Et puis que: P^1 et puis et puis que P^3M et que.
17 presente: P^1 presentes; Socrates: P^1 Sacrates.
18 epicuriens (F^3C^1): P^1C^2 esperitureus *R* esperituans *B* epituriens P^2 epicuiriens *D* epicarijens $P^3A^1A^2MS$ epicurien.
19 stoiciens: F^3 stoijens *B* scortiaus C^1 scortians.
20 efforçant (-ssant, -chant): P^1 efforcent.
21 encontre: *b* au contraire C^1 encontre auls; en: $P^3A^1A^2M$ est.
22 propres: *b* *om.*
22-3 les girons . . . de moy (aP^2D): $P^3A^1A^2MS$ d'icelle ostez (*S* osterent) petiz morceaulx croyant moi du tout leur estre avenue s'en alerent.
23 en yceus pour ce: *R* aincois.
26 ceus: P^1 seus F^3 sens.
28 Caniens ($F^3P^2P^3A^1A^2M$): P^1 Tanieus C^2 Canieus C^1 Caniaus *B* Sanieus *R* Sanians; Seneciens ($P^1C^2BF^3$): C^1 Senecians *R* Essenetians *D* Seracyens $P^3A^1A^2MS$ Senecques; Seranz: P^2 Seraus *R* Senans *B* *om.* *DS* Sorans

memoire n'est pas moult ancienne ne non moult celebrable, les quiex nule chose ne trest oncques a mort fors ce que il, enformés de nos meurs, apparoient estre dessemblable aus estudes *et aus meurs* des mauvais. Si que neanz est que tu te merveilles ou doies merveillier, se nous en ceste amertume de vie sommes demené par tempestes decouranz entour nous aus quiex meismement li propos est itiex, *c'est a savoir* desplaire aus tres mauvais; des quiex ja soit ce que li osz en soit grans, toutevoiz doit il estre despiz car il n'est gouverné par nul duc, ainçois est ravis seulement par erreur folement et communement (4*rb*) courant comme eaue. Et se cil osz ordenans sa compaingnie nous assaut aucune foiz plus fort, certes notre duchesse assemble ses habundances en sa tour et cil sont ententif entour les sarpillieres neant profitables a prendre. Mais nous par desus, asseur de tout le tumulteis forsené et de tel paliz garni que folie engresse et nuisant n'i puet avenir, escharnissons iceus ravisseurs des chosez toutez les tres vilz."

[METRE IV.]

Quiconques hom, renommés de aage bien ordené, mist souz ses piez orgueilleuse destinee et, regardanz touz droiz l'une et l'autre fortune, pot son voult tenir sans estre vaincu, la rage et les menaces de la mer demenant, sa bouture tornee du fons jusques en hault, n'esmouvra pas celui; ne Vesevus, foloiable *montaigne*, toutez les foiz que il tornoie fues fumans par ses cheminees rumpues, ne voie de foudre ardant acoustumee de ferir les hautes tourz, ne le mouvra pas. Li chetif pour quoy merveillent il tant les tyrans felons forsenanz sans forces? Ne esperes riens ne ne craimes pas, tu auras desarmee l'ire du non puissant. Et quiconques tremblables craint ou desire, ce que il ne soit pas estables et de son droit, il a geté son escu et, remués de son lieu, il lace la chaene dont il puisse estre trainéz.

[PROSE IV.]

"Sens tu," ce dist elle, "ces chosez et entrent elles point dedens ton

---

$P^3A^1A^2M$ Sorains F^3 Soreins nons de philosophes.

29 memoire: BRF^3 renommee; non: P^1C^2 non moult; celebrable (*a*): D chelable P^2S celable P^3 celebree A^1A^2M celebre.

30 trest: P^3 trahit; enformés ($P^1C^2P^2A^1A^2M$): DSR enfourme C^1 en fourme P^3 enfourniz BF^3 forme.

32 tu: P^1 *om.*; te merveilles: DS t'esmerveilles; doies: $P^1C^2A^2$ dois.

32-3 en ceste amertume de vie (*a*): *b* en l'amertume de ceste vie.

34 aus: P^1 a; aus tres: C^2 au tres BF^3 entre.

35 osz: BS oz $P^3A^1A^2M$ ost P^2DF^3 ols R oils.

36 despiz: P^3 desprise; duc: F^3 duitre.

37 courant (*a*): *b* decourant; eaue: D ayuwe C^1 yaulle S yaue BRF^3 air (F^3: courant contre air).

39-40 sont . . . prendre (*a*): *b* entendent a aquerre les biens terriens.

41 asseur: F^3 seurs; tout le tumulteis forsené: F^3 touz les tumultes forsenez DS toute le tumulte foursenee; tel: P^2R cel; paliz: P^2A^2 pali DS peril BF^3 seurte.

41-2 que . . . n'i: BF^3 a qui . . . ne A^2 que . . . en.

42 puet: C^2 peut C^1 pot *b* peust; ravisseurs (BF^3): P^1C^2 ravissemenz bC^1R ravissans.

43 les tres: R letres P^3 les plus.

METRE IV.

1 renommés (*and* renommé): P^1 nommes; bien ordené: A^3 desordonne A^2 b. renomme.

2 touz droiz: bP^4F^3 tout droit A^3 *om.*

4 demenant ($bC^1C^2F^1F^3$): P^1 dement R demeuent BA^3P^4 demainent; bouture: B bonne cure A^1 voute; n'esmouvra: $C^1C^2BRF^1P^2P^4A^3$ n'esmouvera A^2MDS ne mouvra P^3A^1 ne mouvera F^3 n'esmoura.

5 Vesevus: F^3 veseus BRA^3P^4 veez vous C^1 ve se nuls C^2 ve se + *lacuna*; fues: bC^1 ses f.

6 fumans: $F^1C^1RP^4$ fumeus; cheminees: P^3 chaynes; voie: P^4 voy le A^2 vie R envoie (*for:* ne voie).

7 le mouvra: F^3 l'esmuura; merveillent (*a, except* BF^3): bBF^3 se m. S esmerveillent A^3P^4 s'esmerveillent.

8 il: $P^1P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; les: *b* des; forsenanz: BF^3 forsenez (*corrected in* F^3 *to* forsenanz) R forsseneus P^4 forcenneux A^3 forceneulx; riens: P^2 *om.*

9 craimes: BRC^1 cremes $P^2P^4F^1F^3$ criemes P^3A^2M craing DS crieng C^2 crains A^1 crain.

10 craint: $C^1F^1P^2DS$ crient R creint; ce que (C^2): P^1F^3B si que *the rest* que; et: *b* *om.*

11 il lace ($P^1C^2BF^3$): P^3P^4 *om.* $F^1RA^1A^2M$ lace P^2 lasche C^1 lachie S sache D saice.

corage, ou es tu donques li asnes de la harpe? Pour quoy pleures tu, pour quoi dequeurs tu de larmes? Se tu atens l'entente de ton mire, il convient que tu descueuvres la plaie."

Lors je qui oi (4*va*) concueilli forces en mon courage li dis: "Est il doncques encores mestiers de amonnestemens *ou de demonstremens* et n'est pas assés apparant par soy meismes l'aspresce de fortune forsenant encontre nous? Ne te esmeut nient la face meismes de cest lieu? Est ce ci l'aumaire des livres que tu meismes avoies esleué tres certain siege a toy en nos mesons, la ou tu desputaies souvent avec moy de la science des chosez humaines et devines? Estoit telz notre habit, estoit telz notre voult, quant je encerchoie avec toy les segrés de nature, quant tu me escrivoies par ta verge les voies des estoiles, quant tu enformaies nos meurs et la raison de toute notre vie a l'examplaire de l'ordre celestial? Enportons nous, a toy obeissans, yces loiers? Certes tu juigas et deis ceste sentence par la bouche de Platon, c'est a savoir que les chosez communes fussent beneurees, se cil qui sont estudians en sapience les gouvernassent ou s'il fust avenu que li gouverneeur d'yceles s'i estudiassent. Tu meismes amonnestas par la bouche de celui meismes homme que necessaire chose estoit d'enprendre aux sages hommes de gouverner la chose commune, pour ce que li gouvernement des citéz delessiéz aus mauvais angres et tourmenteurs citeiens n'aportassent pestillance et destruction aus bons. Je donques ensivanz ceste auctorité desirai metre en fait de commune administracion ce que avoie apris de toy entre nos oiseuses secrees. Tu et diex qui te mist es pensees des sages estes a moy consachable *et savés avecques moy* que nule chose ne me porta onques (4*vb*) a mestrie *ne a dignité* fors que li commun estude de touz biens. De ce me vindrent avec les mauvais desecordes grieves et qui ne pooient estre fenies par prieres et encore autre chose que franchise de conscience tient, c'est a savoir li courrouz des plus puissans hommes tous jours despiz par moy por deffendre droit.

Quantes foiz, alans encontre, reçui je Congaste fesant assaut contre les biens de chascun homme *pouvre et* foible? Quantes foiz osté je Triguille, prevost de la maison le roy, du tort que il avoit commencié et ja neis du tout parfait? Quantes foiz couvri je, par l'auctorité de moy contremise aus perilz, les chetis que l'avarice neant punie des estranges travailloit touz jours? Nus hom ne me detrest onques de droit a tort. Quant je veoie les fortunes du peuple des provinces estre *grevees et* misez au desouz, ou par privees rapines ou par communs paages, je m'en doului non pas autrement que cil qui ce souffroient.

Comme (*le roy Theodoric qui par un chier temps avoit ses greniers plains*

PROSE IV.

2 de: F^3S a.

2-3 pour quoi dequeurs tu: P^1C^2 *om.* BRF^3 p. decours tu.

3 atens: $P^1C^2F^3P^2$ entens; l'entente: P^3A^1SR latente BF^3 l'aide.

7 assés: P^3DS *om.*; aspresce: BF^3 poeste.

8-9 de cest . . . meismes: A^2 *om.*

8 est ce ci (C^1BRF^3): P^1 est ce o C^2 est ce + *space for a single letter* $P^2P^3A^1M$ est ce *DS* est ce le.

12 segrés: bBC^1 secres.

13 enformaies: BF^3 me enformoies RC^1b (*except DS*) me formoies *DS* fourmoies moy; nos (*a*): *b* mes.

14 examplaire: $P^3A^1A^2M$ exemple *R* essample.

14 Enportons: $P^3A^1A^2M$ apportons C^1R en aportons BF^3 et aportons.

14-5 a toy obeissans: $P^2P^3A^1A^2C^1R$ o. a toi.

18 s'i estudiassent: P^3S i estud. A^2 estud. P^1C^2 s'estudiassent en sapience.

21 angres: C^1F^3 engres C^2R augres *b* aigres *B* angelz; tourmenteurs: *S* convoiteux.

24 oiseuses secrees (C^1Bb, *except* P^3, *Chaucer*): $P^1C^2RF^3P^3$ oiseus secres; Tu: P^1C^2 et tu.

25 sages: BRF^3 gens.

26 fors: P^1 fos.

28 fenies ($P^1C^1RF^3$): C^2 finies *b* finees (P^2 feniees) *B* fermes.

30 hommes: P^2DS *om.*; tous jours: P^1 torjors.

31 alans encontre: P^1 alai en. C^2 alai je enc. *S* alons a l'enc.

32 osté: P^3D ostay *S* osta C^1 ostai A^2 este.

35 punie: C^1R pugnie *B* pignie *b* privee.

36 detrest: F^3 traist P^3 detrahit.

38 doului: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ dolu *DS* dolut.

40-4 *le roy . . . cognoissant (gloss): b om. in* C^1 *the gloss is placed after* Comme coemption.

de bles commanda que cist blé fust chierement vendu et fist crier ban que nus n'achetast blé fors que le sien jusques a tant qu'il eust tout vendu, je Boece alai contre cest establissement et le vainqui, le roy meismes sachant et cognoissant) coemption, *c'est a dire communs achéz* griéz et non mie desploiable *commandéz et* establiz seur le peuple ou temps de la fain eigre, fust veuz a degaster *et a tormenter* par souffreté *et par mesaise* la province de Champaigne, je reçui l'estrif encontre le prevost de pretoire pour la raison du commun profit. Je, le roy cognoissant, estrivé (5*ra*) et vainqui que la coempcion ne fust requise *ne ne passast*.

Paulin, homme conseilleur, de qui li chien du palés eussent ja devoré les richesses par esperance et convoitise, fortrés je des joes meismes de ceus qui les ouvroient. Et pour ce que la paine de l'accusacion devant juigiee ne surprist Aubin, homme conseilleur, je me contremis aus haines de Ciprien accuseur. Ne voit on bien donques asséz que je ai ensemblés grans descordes encontre moy? Mais envers ces autres dui je estre plus seurs, qui pour l'amour de droiture ne gardé oncques riens a moy vers ceus du palais roial par quoy je fusse plus seurs. Ainçois sommes dampné par eus meismes accusans, du nombre des quiex Basiles, qui jadis fu chaciéz du servise le roy, a esté constrains en l'accusement de nostre nom par la necessité de l'estrange avoir. *Aussi certes m'accuserent* Opilion et Gaudences comme la justice roial les eust juigiéz a aler en essil pour leurs tricheries montepliablez sans nombre et comme il ne vousissent pas obeir et se deffendissent par la deffense de saintes mesons et ce eust li roys aperceu, il commanda que se il ne se partissent de la cité Ravanne dedens jour assené, qu'il en fussent bouté hors, seigniéz en leur frons de certaines empraintes. Quele chose est avis qui puisse estre pareillé a ceste crualté? Certes en celui jour meismes fu receue l'accusacion de notre nom par eus meismes accusanz. Quelle chose donques puet ici estre dite? L'avoient donques ainsi deservi les notres ars? Ne fist donques la devant dite dampnacion droituriers yceus accuseeurs? (5*rb*) N'ot donques ici fortune point de honte? Se elle n'ot honte de l'innocence accusee, au meins *deust elle avoir eu honte* de la vilté des accusanz.

Mais demandes tu la somme de quel blasme nous sommes accusé? On nous met sus que nous avons voulu sauver la compaignie des senateurs.

---

45 *After* peuple BF^3 *read* comme au temps de l'aigre fain fust establie ou criee grieve et male a espondre coemption la quele si comme l'en veoit bien devoit trop domagier et tormenter la province de Champagne je pris l'estrif encontre le prevost du pretoire et le roy sachant je estrivoi . . .

46 veuz: P^3A^2M veue A^1 venue; a degaster et a torm.: *b inverted.*

46-7 la province de Ch. (*according to* BF^3): C^1R ch. et la prov. *the other manuscripts* Champagne et Province.

47-8 pour (P^1C^2 par) la raison du: BF^3P^3-A^1A^2M pour le.

48 estrivé: RA^1DS estrivai F^3 estrivoi B lestrif.

50 li: P^1C^2 du.

51 joes ($P^2A^1A^2M$): P^3F^3 joues *Chaucer* jowes P^1C^2 joies D yeux S euls C^1 yex B yci R jours.

53 aus (as): $P^1C^1C^2$ en R es.

54-5 Ne voit . . . moy: P^2 *om.*

54 ensemblés: P^1C^2 anegri ensembles (anegri *suppressed by editor*) BRF^3 en aigri et assemble C^1 assamblees anegi D en agri S en egri A^1A^2 aegri P^3M aigry. . . .

55 dui je estre: P^1 dui e. je.

56 gardé: *the other manuscripts* gardai.

57 palais: P^1 paliz.

60 *Aussi*: P^1 ainsi C^2 ainssin.

62 tricheries: P^1C^2 richeces; montepliablez: R monteplaiees et monteplaiables; sans: P^1C^2 en; et: P^1C^2 *om.*

63 la deffense: P^2DSBF^3 les deffenses A^2 les deffense (*sic*); saintes mesons: *b inverted.*

64 se partissent (P^1RP^2): $C^1C^2P^3A^1$ se departissent A^2MDSF^3 se departoient B partoient; Ravanne (-enne): P^1C^2 Ramene.

65 jour: F^3.I. jour P^1C^2 rout; assené ($P^1C^1C^2R$): A^3 asse $P^3A^1MSBF^3$ assigne D assiñe; frons: P^1C^2 fons; certaines: P^1C^2 terriennes.

66 est avis: P^1C^2 est ains C^1BRF^3 est il auis *b* te est il avis.

67 celui: DS celi.

68 ici estre (*a*): *b inverted* (*S*: estre).

69 les notres: BP^3M noz F^3 nous.

69-70 Ne fist . . . accuseeurs: F^3B ou la dampnation devant dite les fist ele justes accuseurs.

70 accuseeurs (accuseurs): P^2DSA^2 accusans.

71-2 Se . . . *honte*: P^1C^2 *om.*

71 se elle n'ot: M *om.* P^3 se eslevoit.

73 demandes: P^1C^2 demande.

74 sus: P^1C^2 assus; avons voulu: P^1C^2 voulons.

Desires tu oir la maniere? Nous sommes blasmés d'avoir empeschié l'accuseur que il ne portast les letres par les quelles il feist coupable le senat contre la majesté du roy. O tu maistraisse, que juges tu donques de ce? Nierons nous le blasme pour ce que honte ne te viengne par nous? Certes je le volz, ne ja par nul temps ne cesserai du vouloir. Nous le recognoistrons? Mais l'entente de l'accuseur empeeschier cessera. Appelerai je donques felonnie et pechié ce que je ai desiré le sauvement de celle ordre? Certes si avoit fait cil ordres, par leur juigemens que il firent de moi, que ce fust felonnie. Mais folie touz jours mentanz a soi meismes ne puet muer les merites des chosez, ne je ne cuide pas, par le juigement Socrates, que je deusse avoir repost verité ne avoir acordé a mençonge. Mais ceste chose, comment que il en soit, je la laisse a preisier au juigement de toy et des sages. De laquelle chose l'ordenance et la verité, pour ce que cil qui vivront aprés nous la peussent savoir, je l'ai baillié neis a escriture et a remembrance. Car des letres faussement faites par les queles je sui accuséz d'avoir esperé la franchise romaine, que m'en apartient il a dire? Des queles li baraz eust apparu touz apers, se nous peussons avoir eu lesir d'user de la presente confession des accuseurs meismes, car ceste chose a tres grans forces en toutez besoingnes. (5*va*) Car quele franchise autre puet l'en esperer? Certes je voudroie que aucune autre peust estre esperee! Je eusse respondu par la parole Canius qui comme il fust accuséz de Gaius Cesar, filz de Germain, que il eust esté consachable de la conjuracion faite contre lui, il dist: "Se je l'eusse seu, tu ne l'eusses pas seu." En la quelle chose nostre pleurs n'a pas si nos sens avugléz que je me complaingne de ce que li mauvais et li felon appareillent felonnies contre les vertueus, mais trop forment me merveil de ce que il ont parfait ce dom il orent esperance. Car vouloir mauvaistiéz c'est par aventure de notre defaut, mais semblable chose est a monstre *et a merveille* comment, ou present regart de dieu, puet estre parfait ce que chascuns felons a conceu en sa pensee contre les innocens. Dom un de tes amis et de tes familiers demanda et n'ot mie tort du demander: "Se diex est," dist il, "dom viennent li mal? Et se diex n'est pas, dom viennent li bien?" Mais or soit licence otroié que li felon homme qui desirent *et requierent* le sanc *et la mort* de touz les bons et de tout le senat aient voulu aler destruire neis nous meismes les quiex il avoient veus bataillier pour les bons et pour

---

75 oir: b (*except* P^3) C^1BF^3 a oir (S: avoir).

76 ne: P^1 *om.* C^2 nous.

77 senat: P^1 senal.

78 pour ce que: P^3 afin que.

79 volz ($RF^3P^2A^2$): C^2P^3M vouls (voulz) A^1 voil C^1DS voel B uō P^1 veulz; par: *b om.*; temps: DS jour.

80 l'entente: P^1C^2 la sentence; empeeschier (empescher): P^1C^2M empeschie A^2 empesche D empaichiet.

81 celle: $P^2DSP^3A^1A^2$ cel C^1 cest.

82 ordre: A^1 orde D ordene; leur: F^3 son (*corrected to* leur) *b* le; firent (*a*; F^3 *corrected to* fist): *b* fist.

84 cuide ($P^1C^1RF^3$): bC^2B cuidoie (A^2 cuidoi).

84-5 juigement Socr.: F^3 j. qui deffendi a celer le bon et a dire le faus Socrates.

85 ne: P^1C^2 *om.*; acordé a menç.: C^1 mencoigne a acorde $P^3A^1A^2M$ acorde m. F^3 ac. menconges B mensonges.

86 en: P^1C^2 *om.*

91 Des queles: F^3 des queles lettres.

92 peussons: P^1 peusons.

93 ceste: P^1 cest; chose: b *om.*; tres: $P^3A^1A^2M$ trop.

94-5 Certes . . . esperee: P^2DS *om.*

96 que il (quil): P^1C^2 qui.

97 eusse seu: F^3 e. consenti.

100 vertueus (*a*): *b* vertus; il (ont): P^1C^2 *om.*

102 est a monstre *et a merveille* (C^1P^2DS): F^3 est a m. et a (*superscript*: est) merv. P^1 a monstre et est a merv. et C^2 a m. et est a merveillier BR est a mostrer et a merveillier $P^3A^1A^2M$ est a mostrer et a merveille.

104 sa: P^1 *om.*

104-5 de tes (fam.): P^1 des.

105 n'ot . . . demander: BF^3 sanz tort.

105-6 Se . . . Et: P^2DS *om.* (*order inverted in* $P^3A^1A^2M$: se diex n'est pas . . . se d. est).

106 pas: P^1 *om.*

107 otroié ($P^1C^1C^2F^3DS$): $P^2P^3A^1A^2MBR$ octroiee; *et requierent*: P^1C^2 *om.*

108 aient voulu aler: B ains volu a. C^2 aint v. a. R aient voulu $P^2P^3A^1A^2M$ aient ale voulu.

109 avoient veus (DS; a. veu BF^3): $P^1C^2P^2A^1A^2M$ voient R soient C^1 voelent P^3 vouloient.

le senat. Mais deservions nous donques aussi ce meismes des peres *et des senateurs?*

Tu te remembres bien, si comme je cuit, que quant je vouloie dire ou faire aucune chose, tu meismes touz jours presente m'adreçoies, et bien te remembre comme li rois glous *et convoiteus* de la commune destruction appareillast (5*vb*) a transporter seur toute l'ordre du senat le blasme de la royal majesté mis sus a Aubin, par com grant seurté de mon peril je ai deffendu l'innocence de tout le senat. Tu sces bien que les chosez que je di sont vraies et que je ne me vantai oncques en nule loenge de moy, car toutez les foiz que aucun reçoit precieuse renommee en soy vantant de son fait il amenuise le secré de la conscience loant soy meismes. Mais tu vois a quele fin je sui venuz de notre innocence; nous recevons paines de fausse felonnie pour les loiers de vraie vertu. Et de quele felonnie ot onques la confession aperte juigiés si acordables en justice *a juigier* que ou l'erreur de l'engin humain ou la condicion de fortune a touz mortiex hommes douteuse n'en abessast aucuns? Se nous fussions acusé de avoir voulu enflamber les sacrees mesons ou de estrangler les prestres de glaive felon ou de avoir appareillié la mort a touz les bons, toutevois la sentence me deust avoir puni presant et recognoissant et convaincu. Mais nous, ores remeu loing *de la cité de Rome* presque par l'espace de cinc cenz mile pas, sommes sans deffense dampné a mort et a essil pour l'estude que nous avons plus forment mis ou senat. O, moult sont ore de bonne merite, onques nus hons ne pot estre convaincuz de semblable blasme. Du quel forfait cil meismes qui m'acuserent en virent la dignité et, pour ce que il la feissent oscure par la commixtion d'aucune felonnie, il *me mistrent assus* et mentirent que j'avoie ordaié (6*ra*) ma conscience par sacrilege pour couvoitise de dignité. Et certes tu neis, entee en nos, boutaies hors du siege de notre courage toute convoitise des choses mortiex ne sacrileges n'avoit pas congié d'avoir lieu souz tes eulz. Car tu degoutoies chascun jour en mes oreilliez et en mes pensees icest commandement de Pitagoras: "L'en doit servir a dieu, *non pas a diex.*" N'il ne couvenoit pas prendre aidez de tres vilz esperis, moy que tu ordenoies en ceste hautece que tu me feisses semblable a dieu. Outre cela, secree chambre *nette et* pure de notre maison, la compaignie de nos tres honnestes amis, et mis socres sainz et redoutables par son fait meismes,

---

110 le senat. Mais (*a; in R a space is left blank for* mais): *b* les senateurs; deservions . . . peres: BF^3 ce meismes n'avions nous pas desservi des peres.

112-3 dire ou faire: $P^3A^1A^2M$ faire ou d.

113 presente m'adreçoies (*b*): P^1C^2R presentement adrecoies C^1BF^3 presente men adrecoies; comme: *BP*^{3}*MD* comment *S* quant.

114 glous: P^2DS glorieus.

115 appareillast: P^2DS appareilla.

116 sus a: P^1C^2BR sus; com: P^2DSA^1M ton A^2P^3 ta *B* si.

117 innocence: P^2S ignorance; senat: BF^3 senat et le blasme de la roial majeste; les chosez: *b* toutes les ch.

118 je (ne): P^1C^2 *om.*; nule: P^1C^2 nule maniere.

120-1 tu vois: P^1C^2 *om.*

121 je sui: P^1 *inverted;* paines: *B* paine F^3 peine *R* poinnes P^3A^1M paiemens.

123 acordables: *b* acordans.

124-5 a touz m. h. douteuse: *b* douteuse a t. m. h.

125 n'en abessast aucuns: *B* nen sousmeist aucuns F^3 nen s. auc. a pite.

126 sacrees (P^1C^2 secrees) mesons: *b inverted* F^3 les eglises sacrees m.

127 avoir appareillie: P^1 appareillier.

128 et (rec.): *b om.*; et (conv.): *b* (*except* P^2) ou; remeu (*according to DS and Chaucer*): C^1 est meu *the other manuscripts* esmeus; loing (*according to* F^3): *the other manuscripts* de loing.

129 pas: P^1C^2 *om.*

130 deffense: *B* deffaute F^3 deffaus; dampné: P^1C^2 *om.*

130-1 pour . . . senat: F^3 pour le bien que j'ai fait au senat (*superscript*: pour l'estude que nous avons plus formant mis au s).

131-2 onques nus hons ne pot estre (*corrected by editor*): *a* onques nus (*R*: mes) d'eus ne p. e. F^3B onques (*B*: o. mais) ne pot estre hons *b* nus homme ne pot onq. estre.

134 j'(avoie): P^1 *om.*

135 ordaié: *S* ordoiet *R* ordoiee BF^3 conchiee.

136 toute: P^2 contre BF^3 toutes (couvoitises).

137 des choses: P^1 de chose C^2 de choses.

138 souz: C^2 sus *DS* sur F^3 devant; tes: P^1C^2 *om.* *D* tels; chascun jour: *b* tous les jours.

139 L'en . . . diex: P^2DS *om.*

142 nos: P^1 nous.

143 honnestes: P^1C^2 h. et vrays; mis socres:

nous deffendent de toute soupeçon de cestui blasme. O, mes ceste felonnie, que il prennent de toi fai et creance de si grant blasme et leur est avis que nous avons esté *voisin et* conjoint a malefice, par ce meismes que nous sommes abevré de tes deceplines et de tes meurs enformés! Et ainsi il ne soufist pas que ta reverence me ait niant profité, se tu de ton gré ne soies plus puissament blasmee par mon courrouz. Mais certes a nos malz *s'aproiche et* se conjoint cist acraissement de malz que *li pris et* li juigement de pluseurs *n'atent pas ne* ne regarde les merites des chosez, mais l'avenement de fortune, et juge celles choses tant seulement estre pourveues de dieu que beneureté recommande, *c'est a dire que tant seulement sont faites bien et pourveablement les chosez que li riche home loent et font.* Dom il avient que bonne presompcion, devant toutez chosez, delaisse les maleurés, *c'est a dire que nulz ne croit que pouvres homs soit preusdom.* Il me poise de remembrer quiex sont ores sus moy (6*rb*) les nouvelles du peuple et comme leur sentences en sont diverses et montepliees. Mais tant en di je que li derreniers fessaus de fortune perverse c'est que quant aucuns blasmes est mis assus as chetis, l'en croit que il aient deservi ce que il en seufrent. Et je qui sui boutéz hors de touz biens, despoilliéz de dignitéz, conchiéz de renommee, ai soufert tourment pour bien faire. Certes il m'est avis que je voy les pensees felonnesses et les cuers des felons hommes habundans de joie et de leesce, *et voy* que chascuns tres mauvais se appareille a trouver nouviax baraz pour acuser les bons, *et voy* que les bons gisent acravanté pour la paour de notre peril, *et voy* chascun tourmenteur estre esmeu a oser felonnie par quitance de paine et a faire la pour loiers, *et voy* que li innocent ne sont pas tant seulement despoillié de seurté, mais neis de defension. Et pour ce me plaist il ainsi a escrier:

[METRE V.]

"O tu feseur de la roe qui porte les estoiles, que es apuiéz a ta chaere pardurable et tournoies le ciel par estourbillons ravissables et contrains les estoiles a soufrir leur lai si que la lune, aucune foiz luisant o ses plaines cornes contremise a toutes les flambes du solail, repoingne *et occurcisse* les

---

R mis ocres P^1C^2 mi socres P^2A^2 mes s. A^1 mes secres *S* mes sacres *D* secres *M* neis s. (neis *erased and corrected*) P^3 mon socre BF^4 mon otroi (F^3: et Simacus li peres ma fame qui est sainz hons et de grant reverence et mon outroi sainz et redoutables par son fet meismes nous deffendent toute soupeçon); son fait (*a*): *b* ses fes.

144 deffendent: *b* deffendoient.

144 O, mes ceste (*according to* C^1: o mais ceste): P^1C^2 o met ceste *R* ho mes ce est *B* o mais cest F^3 o mes ce est P^2D mes o ce est $P^3A^1A^2S$ mais (A^1: mez) cest *M* mes ceste.

146 avons . . . nous: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; malefice ($P^1C^1C^2$): BF^3 mal office *R* mal fice P^2DS malice $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

147 de tes meurs enformés: *b* enfourmez de tes m.; ainsi (*a*: C^1 ensi C^2 ainssin): *b* aussi.

148 me ait: F^3 ne maist *D* ne me ait *S* a moy ne P^3M n'ait P^2 ait.

151 atent (*a except BR*: atent): *b* entent.

151-2 mais . . . que: P^2 *om.*

151 avenement: P^1 avement.

152-3 celles . . . recommande: *inserted in the text according to b.*

153 *c'est a dire: added by editor.*

153-4 *que . . . font*: *b om.*

154 *pourveablement*: BRF^3 profitablement; *et*: F^1F^3 ou.

155 delaisse: P^1C^2 laisse; maleurés: *b except* P^2 maleureus (-eux) *B* maleurtez.

154-5 avient que . . . maleurés: F^3 av. que ce qui premierement lesse les maleureus ce est bonne opinion, que bonne presumption, etc.

157 sus: F^1F^3 seur BP^3DS sur; comme: $P^2P^3A^2M$ comment.

158 leur: bBF^3 les.

159 fessaus: F^3 fessiaus C^2 faisiaus F^1 faisseaus $P^3A^1A^2M$ faissel (fessel); c'est que: F^1DS c'est.

160 assus as: $P^3A^1A^2MS$ sus aux C^1BRF^3 sus au F^1 au.

161 conchiéz: P^3 ordoye.

163 cuers: *R* cours *B* tors C^1 coers; dos: P^1 *om.*; habundans: P^2DS habunder $P^3A^1A^2M$ habondez.

167 de paine: P^1C^2B *om.*; la pour: *DS* le paour pour.

METRE V.

1 feseur: A^3 faiseurs A^2C^2 faisours $P^2P^4DC^1F^3R$ faisierres (fe-) F^1 li fesirres *S* faiserres *B* faiserresse; apuiéz: P^1 espuies F^1P^2S apoiez C^1 apoijes; a: P^1F^1 en.

3 o: P^1 a.

4 contremise: P^1B contremisez; repoingne *et occurcisse*: *B* repont et oscurcist F^3 responu et obscurci (*two glosses superscript:* a) rescont respone b) resconde et obscurcisse) P^4 reponra et obscura.

estoiles meneurs, et que elle, aucune foiz pale o ses cornes oscures quant est au plus pres du solail, perde ses clartéz, et que *l'estoille journal qui est apelee* Hesperus *quant elle nest au soir* qui ou temps de la premiere nuit maine ses froides naissances *en esté,* mue derechief ses acoustumés cours et palist au matin en la naissance du soleil et lors est appelee Lucifer *et c'est en yver.* Tu restrainz le jour par plus brieve demeure en temps froit de yver qui (6*va*) fait cheoir les feueilles. Tu devises et eslongnes les ineles heures de la nuit quant li chaus estéz est venus. Ta puissance atrempe le divers an si que Zephirus, li debonnairez vens, raport en printemps les feueilles que li vent de bise tost en autompne et que les semences que Arcturus vit deviengnent haus bles que Sirius eschaufe *et seche.* Nule chose n'est desliee de sa loy ancienne ne ne laisse l'euvre de son propre estat.

Tu gouverneur, gouvernanz toutez chosez par certain terme, refusez seulement *a gouverner et* a refrener par maniere bonne et digne les fez des hommes. Car pour quoy *sueffres tu que* fortune escoulouriable tourne si grans entrechangemens de chosez? *Je voy que* paine coupable, qui devroit punir les felons homes, punist les innocens et li mauvais, qui les meurs ont pervers, sieent en haulte chaere et li nuisant marchent a tort seur les colz des sains hommes. Vertu resplendissant *naturelment en soy* se tapist reposte en tenebres oscurez et porte li droituriers le blasme *et la paine* du felon. Ne li perjurement ne li baraz couvers de mençongiere couleur ne nuisent riens aus mauvais, mais quant il leur plaist a user de leurs forces, s'esjoissent il metre souz eus les souverains rois que tuit li peuple redoubtent.

O tu, quiconque tu es qui les aliances des choses anlaces, regarde donques ja les chetives terres; nous hommes, qui sommes non mie vilz partie de si grant euvre, sommes tourmenté par la mer de fortune. Tu gouverneur, *reprain et* refraingne les ravissables floz et ferme les terres estables par celle aliance par quoy tu gouvernez le ciel grant sans mesure." (6*vb*).

---

5 pale: $P^1BRA^3P^4$ parle.

6-7 *qui est apelee*: $BRF^3A^3P^4$ *om.* *DS* que on appelle.

7 Hesperus: A^3 Espart; *nest*: F^3 nait P^2 vait *the rest* naist; *soir*: A^3BF^3 jour.

8 maine: *DS* fait P^2A^3 *om.*; naissances: P^1C^2 necessances A^1A^2 naistences; *en esté*: A^3C^1 en ceste *b* et; mue: A^3 vie *S* remuet.

9 en: *R* a *b* par; naissance: P^1 necessance A^1 naistence P^3M naiscence; appelee: P^1D appele.

9-10 *et . . . yver*: A^3P^4R et naist en i. *B* et va en yver F^3 et vait devant *b* *om.*

10-1 Tu . . . yver (*according to* F^1): P^1C^2 *om.*

11 eslongnes: $C^2F^1BRA^3P^4$ aloignes (alongnes) C^1 alonges F^3 *om.* *b* abreges.

12 ineles: C^2F^1M isneles *D* inieles BRP^3 vieilles P^4 vies les F^3 ignelles vielles *S* froides C^1 males A^3 *om.*; heures: P^1 euures C^2 ouures C^1 oeres *D* eures.

13 an si: A^3 aussi; raport (P^1C^2R): $BC^1F^1F^3A^3P^4$ raporte *b* aporte.

14 tost ($P^1C^2P^2A^1$): $BRF^3P^3A^2M$ toult (tolt) C^1DS taut F^1 tout A^3P^4 *om.*

15 haus bles ($BRF^1A^1A^2D$): P^1 haublez C^2MSP^4 haulz (-s, -x) bles $P^2F^3A^3$ haut bles P^3 aux bles.

16 ancienne: A^3P^4 anciennement.

18 gouverneur: C^2 gouvernours BC^1F^3S gouvernerrez (-eres) F^1RP^2 gouvernieres *D* gouvrenerez A^3 gouvernes et.

20 escoulouriable ($P^1C^1C^2$): F^1F^3 escoloriable *B* escoulourable *R* escoulorgable P^2DS escoulourgable A^1M estaloriable A^3 escaloriable P^4 escalouriable A^2 escaloria P^3 si variable.

21 coupable: $P^3A^1A^2M$ coulpable P^2 courpable F^1R corpable $BF^3A^3P^4$ commune.

22 les meurs ont: *b inverted.*

23 a tort: BRA^3P^4 *om.*

24 resplendissant: P^1 replendissant.

27 a: *added according to R and according to* Prose IV, l. 169; s'esjoissent il: *b inverted* BRF^3 si s'esjoissent C^1 s'esj.; metre ($P^1C^2F^1$): *the rest* a metre.

28 les: P^1 li.

29 O tu . . . re (-garde): A^2 *om.*; tu es: *D* teis es *S* telz es; aliances: F^3 aleances A^3P^4 alieches *B* aleges; anlaces: *B* enlaciees A^3M enlacees P^4 enlaciez C^1 en lachent; regarde: A^3 regardes C^1 regardent.

29-30 donques ja: *b inverted* F^1A^3 donques.

30 vilz: P^2DS vil $P^3A^1A^2M$ vile.

32 *reprain*: C^2 reprains F^1 repraim F^3S repraing P^4 repran $P^2A^1A^2M$ resprain P^3 respraign BRA^3 reoren *D* reprens C^1 repreing; refraingne (P^1C^2): F^1P^2D refraine P^4 refraignes *R* refreigne $P^3A^1A^2M$ refrene *B* refrenes F^3 refraing A^3 refrains C^1 refraig *S* *om.*; ferme: P^1A^3 fermes.

33 sans: A^3P^4 par.

[PROSE V.]

Puis que je oi dit ces chosez en breant par continuee douleur a guise de chien abaiant, elle o son voult pesible et neant esmeue par mes complaintes dist: "Comme je t'eusse veu triste et pleurant, je connui tantost que tu estoies chetis et exilliéz. Mais je ne savoie pas combien lointieus fust cist exilz, se ta parole ne le m'eust monstré. Mais certes tu n'es pas moult loing boutéz hors de ton pais, mais tu as failli. Et se tu veulz mieux cuider que tu en soies hors boutéz, tu meismes t'en as boutéz hors mieux que autres, car nulz fors que tu ne peust onques avoir ce fait de toi. Car se tu te remembres de quel pais tu as esté nez, il n'est pas gouvernés par empire *ne par commandement* de multitude, si comme fu jadis li pais des Atheniensiens, mais un seul en est sires, *c'est un dieu* qui s'esjoist du hanteiz *et de la demourance* de ses citeiens, non pas de bouter les hors en exil; et est souveraine franchise de estre gouverné par les frains de celui et obeir a sa justice. *As tu donques oublié ou* ne sces tu pas celle tres ancienne loy de ta cité par la quelle il est jugiés que quiconques voudra mieux ileuc fonder son siege *et sa maison que ailleurs,* il n'en a pooir de estre exilliéz? Car qui ou paliz et ou garnissement de celle cité est contenuz, il n'a nul paour que il deserve a estre exilliéz. Mais qui laissera le vouloir de habiter dedens, il laisse aussi tost a deservir qu'il n'en puisse estre exilliéz. Si que la face de ce lieu ne me esmeut pas tant comme la teue face ne je ne requier pas mieux les paraiz de t'aumaire *ou de ta chambre* aournees de yvoire et de voirre que je faiz le siege de ta pensee en (7*ra*) la quele je mis jadis non mie livres, mes ce qui fait les livres precieus, c'est a savoir les sentences de mes livres. Et certes de tes merites mises ou bien commun tu en as dit verité, mais selonc la multitude de tes fais tu en as pou dit. De honnesté ou de la fausseté des chosez opposees contre toy as tu remembré chosez que tuit cognoissent. Des felonnies et des baraz de tes accuseurs te sembla il certes *bon et* adroit que tu entoichasses briefment, pour ce que ces chosez sont celebrees *et loees* mieux et plus plenteureusement par la bouche du peuple recognoissant toutez les chosez. Tu blasmas neis forment le fait des senateurs qui ne fu pas droituriers, et te douleus neis de nostre blasme et pleuras aussi les domages de ta renommee bleciee. Ta derreniere douleur s'eschaufa encontre fortune et te es complains que li loier ne sont pas igaument rendus aus merites. Ou derrenier de ta muse forsenant, feis prieres que celle paix qui gouverne le ciel gouvernast aussi

---

PROSE V.

1 je oi: F^1 je Boece oi P^3 j'euz A^1A^2 j'eu *M* je eu *S* j'ay BRF^3 je t'ai.

2 o: P^1 a.

3 et: P^1C^2 en.

4 lointieus: *S* long tāps F^3 loing *the rest* lointain (lointaing); fust: *D* ert *S* est.

5 moult: *DS* trop.

6 cuider: $P^3A^1A^2M$ estre dit.

8 tu (ne): $P^3A^1A^2MB$ toi; onques: *added according to* F^1F^3R; avoir ce fait: $P^3A^1A^2MC^1$ ce av. f.; de toi: *B* que toy P^1C^2 *om.*

10 Atheniensiens (*BR*): P^1C^2 Atheniensiers.

11 du hanteiz: C^2 du haulteiz *B* du honteux C^1 del antise F^1 du h. et de la compagnie et.

12 ses: P^1C^2 ces.

13 franchise: *b* chose; les frains: *R* le fraing BF^3 le frain; celui: F^3 iceluy *B* iceli $P^2P^3A^2$-*DS* celi F^1RC^1 cele.

14 ne sces tu pas: *b* non (*S om.*); ancienne: *S* saintisme.

16 il n'en a pooir ($P^1C^1C^2F^1$): P^2DS il n'a p. BRF^3 il n'aura p. $P^3A^1A^2M$ il ne puet.

17-8 Car . . . exilliéz: P^3 *om.*

17 paliz: $A^1A^2MC^2$ palaiz C^1 pays; garnissement: *b* gouvernement.

18 paour: *B* pooir F^3 pouoir P^2 *om.* (*marginal*: honte ou doute).

19 laisse: *b* laissera; n'en: P^1 ne.

21 je: P^2DS *om.*; *ou de ta chambre*: *b om.*

24 certes: *b om.*; de tes merites: *B* de tes merveilles et de tes m.; tes: *D* tels *S* ces; mises: P^1C^2 mis.

25 dit: *b* bien d.

26 des: P^1 de ces; opposees: P^1D apposees.

27 tuit: P^1 tu; de: P^1C^2 et de.

28 sembla il (F^3): C^1 sanla il P^1C^2 sembla *bBR* semble il; *bon*: *b* bien; adroit: *b* (*except* P^3) droit (*R*: bon certes et adr. *B*: certes bon seroit et adr. P^3: c. bien adr. A^1A^2: c. bien dr.); briefment: P^3 bonnement.

29 celebrees *et loees*: *b inverted.*

30 blasmas: P^1C^2 blasmes.

31 forment: *b om.*

32 aussi: P^1 ainsi C^2 ainssin *S om.*

34 rendus: P^1 rendu.

35 gouvernast: P^1 gouverne; aussi: P^1 ainsi C^2 ainssin.

les terres. Et pour ce que pluseurs turbacions de desiriers t'ont assailli et douleur et ire et pleur te traignent diversement, si comme tu es ore de pensee faible, tu n'as encores mestiers de plus fors remedes. Or usons donques d'un petit plus legiers pour ce que les plaies, qui par perturbacions seurvenans sont endurcies en enfleure, se amolissent par plus souef atouchement a recevoir la force de plus aigre medecine."

[METRE VI.]

Quant li soleus est ou Cancre, cil qui lors baille largement ses semences aus chans qui les refusent a recevoir, aille s'en, deceuz de la fiance qu'il avoit en son blé, aus glans des chesnes. Se tu veulz (*7rb*) cuillir violetes, ne va jamés au bois vermeil quant li champ sont *roide et* hericié de froit par les felons venteiz de aquilon. Se tu veuz user de grapes de roisins, ne va pas contraindre par gloute main les ceps de vingne en prin temps: Bachus *li diex des vins* a miex donné ses dons a autompne *que a yverz.* Diex seigne les temps et les ajouste a leur propres offices; ne ne sueffre pas que les fais qu'il a refrenees soient entremellees. Ainsi ce qui delaisse ordre certaine par trop isnele voie ne vient pas a bonne fin.

[PROSE VI.]

"Premierement, donques, me souffreras tu a atouchier par pou de demandes l'estat de ta pensee pour ce que je entende quiex sera la maniere de ta curacion?" "Tu," dis je, "demande moy ce que tu voudras, si comme a homme prest de respondre". Lors dist elle: "Cuides tu que cist mondes soit gouvernéz par cas fols et fortuniex, ou cuides tu que il i ait nul gouvernement de raison?" "Certes," dis je, "je ne cuideroie en nule maniere que si certaines chosez fussent meues par fortunele folie; aincies sai que diex li feseur est maistres et gouverneur de son euvre, ne jamais ne sera nus jours qui me boute hors de la verité de ceste sentence".

"Ainsi est", dist elle; "car ce meismes chantas tu un pou devant et pleuras de ce que li hommes tant seulement estoient hors de la cure de dieu. Car de ces autres chosez que eles ne fussent par raison gouvernees n'estoies tu de riens esmeuz. Mais forment me merveil pour quoi tu es malades puis que tu es mis en si salvable sentence. Mais encerchons plus hault; car je

---

36 turbacions (P^1C^2R): B troublacions C^1 t'bations b tribulacions.
37 et pleur: b *om.*; traignent (*corrected from* craignent): C^2 crainent C^1 trainent BR trainet b trahinent (S traient).
41 souef: b legier.

METRE VI.

1 cil: P^1C^2 *om.* B ceulz; baille ($P^1C^1C^2R$): P^4 a baillie B ont baillie A^3 abille b bailla.
2 aus chans: P^1 au chans; s'en: R sens D sent S sont; deceuz: A^3P^4 de ceulx.
3 aus glans des chesnes (b): P^1 ou glandes chesnes C^2 ou glandes de chesnes C^1 angles (i.e. au glẽs) BRA^3P^4 aux glandes des chesnes.
4 jamés: b pas; hericié: P^1 herite C^2 heritez C^1 hyreciet.
5 felon venteiz: A^3P^4B felonnetes.
7 Bachus . . . *yverz*: P^3 *om.*; autompne: C^2 amptonne M antonne C^1 antoine; *a yverz* (a): b au prins temps.
8 sueffre: P^1C^2 seust.
9 Ainsi (*according to* BC^2): *the rest* aussi; ce (P^1C^2BR): $P^2P^3A^2$ cil A^1M cilz C^1 chieuls DS que.
10 isnele (P^1C^2): P^2 inele (?) R uíelle $BC^1P^3P^4A^3$ male A^1A^2MDS mole.

PROSE VI.

1 tu: b *om.*
2 quiex sera: b *om.*
5 fols: F^1 foux M faux A^1 fos $P^1C^1C^2P^2$ fors (P^2 *corrected by another hand to* fols) BR felons; i: $P^1C^1C^2R$ *om.*
7 meues: b (*except* P^2M) C^1B menees; fortunele folie (aP^2): DS fortuneles follies A^1A^2M fortune folie P^3 fole fortune; aincies (F^1): P^1 ainsiez $BRP^3A^1A^2M$ aincois DS ainchois C^2 ainczois P^2 ancois C^1 anchois.
8 feseur: C^2 faisours F^1 fesierres C^1RP^2DS faisierres.
10 "Ainsi est," dist elle (a, *except* C^1): P^3 ainsi est il d. e. $P^2A^1A^2MDS$ aussi dist elle est il C^1 ensi dist elle; devant: b ci d.
11 la cure: F^1 *om.*
13 es (mal.): P^1 gis C^2 yes.
14 salvable: b sauvable (A^1A^2 sannable) BC^1 sauuable R vaillable; encerchons: P^3 enquerons C^1 alons encerquier; hault: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
14-5 car je cuide (B: cuidoie) bien savoir ce qui (B: qu'il) te faut (a): b je apercoif bien qu'il te faut je ne sce quoi.

cuide bien savoir ce qui te faut. Mais di moy, puis que tu ne dou- (7*va*) tes pas que cist mondes ne soit gouvernéz par dieu, aparceus neis par quiex gouvernaus il est gouvernéz?"

"Je cognois", dis je, "a paine la sentence de ta demande, si que je ne puisse pas respondre a tes enquestes". "Je ne sui pas", dist elle, "deceue qu'il ne te faille aucune chose par quoy maladie de perturbacions est entree dedens ton courage, aussi comme par la forterece du palis *derompue et* ouverte. Mais dis moy, te remembres tu quiex est la fins des chosez et a quel lieu tent l'entencion de toute nature?" "Je l'avoie jadis oi", dis je, "mais douleur *et pleur* a reboiché ma memoire". "Et ses tu dom toutez chosez sont venues?" "Bien le sai", dis je, et respondi que diex est commencement de tout. "Et comment", dit elle, "puet ce estre fait, puis que tu cognois le commencement des chosez, que tu mescognoisses quiex en est la fins? Mais itiex sont les costumes des perturbacions; ce pooir ont elles qu'elles peuent mouvoir homme de son lieu, mais arrachier le du tout et lui tout estreper a soy meismes ne peuent elles pas. Mais je voudroie que tu me respondissez a ce: te remembres tu que tu soies hom?"

"Pour quoi", dis je, "ne m'en remembreroit il?" "Pourras me tu donques dire quel est hom?" "Me demandez tu ce: ne sai je bien que je sui beste raisonnable et mortel? Ce sai je bien et bien recognois que je le sui." Et lors dist elle: *"En as tu plus seu?* Sces tu que tu soies nule autre chose?" "Nenin."

"Or sai je", dist elle, "autre cause et neis tres grant de ta maladie. Tu as laissié a cognoistre qui tu es. Par quoy je ai tres plainement trouvé ou (7*vb*) la raison de ta maladie ou l'entree de recouvrer ta santé. Car pour ce que tu es confundus par l'oubliance de toi meismes, pour ce es tu douluz de estre exilléz et de estre despoilliéz de touz tes biens. Mais pour ce que tu mescognois quiex est la fin des chosez, pour ce cuides tu *et juges* que li felon homme et mauvais *et desleal* soient puissant et beneuré. Et pour ce que tu as oublié par quiex gouvernaus est gouvernés li mondes, par ce cuidez tu que ces mutacions de fortunes flotent sens gouverneur. Grans sont ces causez non pas tant seulement a maladie, mais certes a mort. Mais je rens graces au feseur de santé de ce que nature ne t'a pas du tout delaissié. Nous avons grant norrissement de ton salut—c'est la vraie sentence du gouvernement du monde—pour ce que tu cres que cil gouvernement soit sommis non pas a la folie des cas aventurex mais a divine

---

15 doutes: *b* cuides.

16 aparceus (*correction of* P^1C^2: et par ceus): *the rest* apercois.

17 gouvernaus (*correction of* P^1C^2: -ans): BP^2DS gouvernemens C^1R gouvrenemens $P^3A^1A^2M$ (quel) gouvernement

19 puisse pas (P^1C^2R): $BC^1P^2P^3M$ puis pas A^1A^2DS puis.

21 dedens: *DS* en.

23 jadis oi", dis je: P^3 ja dis je oi dire *BR* jadis oi dire.

24 reboiché (P^1C^2): RP^2P^3D rebouchiee A^1A^2M rebouchee BC^1 reboutee *S* reblonchie (?).

25 chosez: *b* ces ch.

27 mescognoisses: P^1C^2D mescognois C^1 ne cognois; en: P^1C^2 *om.*

30 estreper: *DS* extirper *M* attraper *B* estre puet; meismes: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; ne peuent: P^1C^2 ce ne p.; elles: P^1 elle.

32 "Pourras me tu: P^1p. tu me BA^2 me p. tu.

33 "Me demandez tu ce: F^1 *om.* C^1 pourquoi non dis je; ce . . . sui: F^1 Boece: ce sai je bien que je sui *S* se je ne sai moy estre P^3 ce ne scai je bien et bien le recougnoiz que j. s.

33-5 que je . . . je bien: A^1A^2M *om.*

34 beste raisonnable: P^3 homme rationnel.

34-5 ce . . . sui: F^1P^3 *om.*

34 recognois: P^1 cognois.

35 Et . . . *seu*: F^1 *om.*; Sces tu: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; nule: $C^2A^1A^2MS$ plus nulle P^3 plus.

36 "Nenin" (P^1F^1): C^2 nenni C^1BRA^1MD nennil (nenil) A^2P^2 nanil P^3 nanil dis je *S* *om.*

38 tres (F^1BRDSP^2): $P^3A^1A^2M$ trop $P^1C^2C^1$ *om.*; plainement: *b* planteureusement.

40 es (conf.): P^1C^2 *om.*

42 mescognois: P^1 mescogneus *S* ne cognois; est la fin des chosez: *b* (*except* P^3) la f. des ch. est.

44 gouvernaus (*corrected from* P^1C^2: -ans): F^1BC^1PS gouvernemens $RP^3A^1A^2MD$ gouvernement; li $P^3A^1A^2MB$ le P^1 cist C^2 cest.

46 causez: P^2 choses.

49 gouvernement: P^2DS gouverneur; tu: P^1C^2 *om.*: cres (*corrected from* P^1: tres); *the rest* crois.

50 cas: P^1 quas; divine (*b*): *a om.*

raison. Ne craimes donques riens; chaleur de vie sera ja luisant en toy de ceste tres petite estancele. Mais pour ce que li temps n'est pas encores venus aus plus fermez remedes et la nature des pensees est tele que toutez les fois que elles gettent les vraies opinions elles se vestent des fausses des quiex nest l'occurté de perturbacions confundans ycelui vrai regart, je assaierai a atenuraier la un petit par norrissemens soués et moiens, si que, les tenebres des decevans desiriers ostees, tu puissez cognoistre la resplendisseur de vraie lumiere."

[METRE VII.]

Les estoilles repostes es noires nues ne peuent espandre nule clarté. Se li troublable vens de ploigeau, tor- (*8ra*) noians la mer, y mesle l'ordure du fons, l'unde clere jadis comme vairres et semblable aus biaus jours serins, tantost ordaiee par la boe resolte, empeesche les veues. Et li fleuves qui diversement dequeurt es hautes montaingnes s'areste souvent par l'estoupail d'une pierre cheant d'aucune roiche. Aussi se tu veulz a clers yeux regarder verité et tenir chemin par droit sentier, gar toy de joie et de douleur et de esperance et de paour. Tenebreuse est la pensee et liee de frains quant ces chosez y regnent.

[BOOK II.]

[PROSE I.]

Aprés ces chosez elle se tut un petit; et quant elle aperçut par atrempee tesance que je estoie bien ententis a li oir, elle commença ainsi a parler: "Se je ai cogneu du tout les causez et la maniere de ta maladie, tu te defaus par l'entalentement et par le desirier de ta premiere fortune. Icelle tant seulement muee, si comme tu fains a toy meismes, a mué l'estat de ton courage. Je entens les diverses *simulacions et* les couleurs de celui monstre, *c'est de fortune*, et comment elle porte tres soueve familiarité *et tres habondant amour* a ceulz que elle s'esforce a decevoir jusques a tant que elle les confonde par douleur neant souffrable, ceulz que elle aura deguerpiz contre leur esperance. Et se tu remembres bien la nature, les meurs et la merite de li, tu cognoistras que tu n'eus onques en cest siecle

---

51 craimes (P^1R): F^1 criemes C^2B crains C^1 crieng P^2 doutes tu P^3 te doubtes A^1M te doubte A^2DS doubte; en (F^1b): *a* (*except* F^1) a.

52 estancele: *the other forms are* estencele, estincelle, estinchiele (*DS*).

54 les (vraies): P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 leur.

54-5 des . . . per(turbacions): *b om.* (*S*: *instead of the cited passage*: opinions ou).

56 assaierai: P^1C^2 asseliere; atenuraier (? P^1R): F^1 atenuyaier A^1A^2M atenurier *S* atenurier ou amenuisier P^3 attenuir P^2B atennoier *D* atennenoier C^1 *om.* (C^1 je assaierai par tes voies par nourrissemens soues . . . .); moiens (C^1b): $P^1C^2F^1$ isneaus *R* ineus *B* meurs.

57 decevans: P^1C^2 faulz.

METRE VII.

1 repostes: A^3 reposent P^3 mucees; es: P^1C^2 et; noires nues: *b inverted;* nule: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aucune.

2 ploigeau (F^1): P^1C^2 plaing eaue *B* plungieu *R* plougau P^4 plongeu A^3 plungent et *b* (*except* P^3) plugeul P^3 pluye C^1 pleuue; tornoians (bF^1RP^4): C^1 en t. *B* tournans A^3 tournoient P^1C^2 detornanz; y mesle: C^1F^1 i melle C^2 et mesle P^2 il melle *R* isnele BA^3P^4 esveille $P^3A^1A^2M$ mesle *DS* merle.

3 biaus: *S* vrais.

4 ordaiee (-iee *according to BR*): P^1 ordaie C^2 ordaiez $F^1P^2P^4$ ordoie C^1 ordoie et BRP^3-A^1A^2M ordoiee A^3 il se ordit; resolte: P^3 resolue; veues: A^3P^4 vaines.

5 diversement: *R* durement; souvent: b *om.*

6 l'estoupail (F^1P^3MS): A^1A^2 l'estopail *D* l'estoupeil P^1C^2 le coupail *R* la copail P^3 le cõpail (*marginal*: le stoupal) BP^4 le souspirail A^3 le souppiral C^1 le compas.

7 yeux: A^3P^4 jours; verité: *R* voiriete A^3P^4 clerement et vrayement; gar (P^1F^1): *the rest* garde.

8 liee: *DS* loie.

BOOK II.

PROSE 1.

1 tut (C^2R): P^1 tu *B* tust C^1F^1b (*except* P^2) teut P^2 tot.

2 li: F^1 lie *S* lui $P^1C^2P^3$ le; commença: $P^3A^1A^2M$ en c.

3 te: *DS om.*

4 defaus: BRP^3A^2M deffens; par l'ent. et: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

5 tant seul.: *b om.*; si: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

7 soueve: bC^1 souef.

nule bele chose ne riens bel n'i perdis. Mais, si comme je cuit, il ne me convient pas moult travaillier a faire toy remembrer de ces chosez. Car tu la soulaies assail- (8*rb*) lir par paroles de hommes *fors et roides,* neis quant elle estoit presente et te flatait, et li coroies sus *et la despisaies* par sentences tretes de nostre secré. Mais nule soudaine mutacion de chosez n'avient que li courage n'en saient aussi comme esmeu en aucune maniere; et ainsi a il esté fait que tu maismes te saies un petit departiz de la paix de ton courage.

Mais or est li temps venuz que il te convient boire et mengier aucune chose mole et delitable que, quant elle sera entree en tes entrailles, face voie aus plus fors medecines. Or soit donques o nous li amonnestement de la douceur de rethorique qui tant seulement vet lors droite voie, quant elle ne laisse pas nos establissemens. Et avec rethorique viegne musique, la damoisele de nostre maison, qui nous chante vers aucune foiz plus legiers, aucune foiz plus pesans. Quele chose est ce donques, o tu homme, qui t'a getéz en tristece et en pleur? Je croy que tu as veu aucune chose nouvelle et desacoustumee. Tu cuidez que fortune se soit muee envers toi; tu faus. Tiex sont touz jours ses meurs; tele est sa nature. Elle a miex gardé envers toy sa propre estableté en ceste muance de soy meismes. Telle estoit elle quant elle te blandisoit et quant elle se joiait a toy *et te decevoit* par les allechemens de fausse beneureté. Or as tu cogneu le doubtable visage de la deesse avugle. Elle qui encore se queuvre aus autres a monstré soi meismes toute a toy. Se tu la loes, use de ses meurs et ne te complaing pas. Se tu *ne la loes pas, ainçois* la redoubtez et tiens (8*va*) pour tricherresse. despiz la et gete loins de toy puis que elle deçoit ainsi les gens destruiablement. Car elle qui est orendroit a toy cause de si grant doleur, elle meismes te deust lors estre cause *de leesce et* de pesibleté. Car elle t'a delessié n'il n'est nul homme qui puisse estre seurs que elle ne le delaisse.

Mais or me di, juges tu donques a precieuse beneurté qui s'en fuira? Et *ameras tu et* tendras chiere la fortune presente qui n'est pas *loyaus ne* seure de demorer et, quant elle s'en sera alee, elle te metra en douleur? Et se elle ne puet estre retenue selonc nostre volenté et nous fait chetis quant elle s'enfuit, quelle autre chose donques est fortune fuiable fors uns demonstremens de chetiveté a venir? Car il ne doit pas suffire a regarder ce qui est *presentement* assis devant les yeux; sage hom *regarde et* mesure les fins des chosez, et une meismez muableté de l'une fortune en l'autre fait *et demonstre* que nulz ne doit redoubter les menaces de fortune ne desirier ses blandices. Au derrenier il convient que tu seufres par igal courage toutez les choses qui aviennent en cest monde, puis que tu as mis ton col une foiz souz le jou *de sa cherue.* Mais se tu veulz mettre lai de demourer et de aler a fortune que tu as prise de ton gré pour estre ta dame, ne li feras tu mie tort et la feras tu estre aigre encontre toi par ta non-souffrance, ne n'as pooir de li muer?

---

12 riens: *b* onques r.; bel: *BR* bon; n'i: F^1C^1 ne.
13 moult: *b* trop.
14 paroles de hommes: C^1R p. de homme *b* parole d'omme; *roides*: *DS* roit.
18 un petit departiz: *bR inverted.*
21 tes: P^1C^2 *om.*
25 vers aucune foiz: *bB* auc. f. vers.
27-8 Je . . . desacoustumee: P^2 *om.*
28 toi: P^1C^2 moy.
29 touz jours: *S* toudis.
30 de: P^1C^2 que de.
32 allechemens: P^1 alegemens.
35 tricherresse: *S* tristesse.
36 despiz: *M* despise C^1 despite; et (gete): P^1C^2 *om.*; gens: *D* grans *S* gñs.
37 a toy: $P^2P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
37-8 de si . . . cause: *B om.*
38 te deust lors estre (C^2R): P^1 te d. estre lors A^1A^2MS deust lors e. *D* deust lors e. a toy C^1 te deust e. P^3 deust e. P^2 lors est *B om.*
39 nul homme: P^1 *inverted* *B* homme.
44 donques: P^1C^2 *om.*; fuiable: C^1 finable *M* feable P^3 variable.
45 a venir: *D* avoir.
47 les fins: P^1C^2 la fins.
51 *sa*: $P^1C^2P^2$ la; *cherue*: C^1 kerue *the rest* charrue; et: *b* ou.
53 aigre: C^1 engre; encontre: P^1C^2 et contre C^1BR contre P^3 et encontre; ta: P^1C^2 *om.*; as: P^1C^2 a.

Se tu mettoies tes vailez aus vens, tu t'en yroies non pas la ou tu voudroies, mais la ou li vens te bouteroit. Se tu gettoies es chans tes semences, tu trouveroies en ta pensee les ans entreuz planteureuz et brahainz. Tu (8*vb*) as donné toi meismes a gouverner a Fortune; si convient que tu t'acordez aus meurs de ta dame. Te efforces tu a retenir le cours isnel de sa roe tournant? O tu li tres fols de touz les mortiex hommes, se elle commence a estre estable, elle delaisse a estre Fortune."

[METRE I.]

Quant elle a tourné ses muances par sa destre orgueilleuse et est portee ainsi comme se porte Eurupus esboillans—*c'est un naturex cours marins qui ores receit les ondes de la mer et ores les revomist hors*—elle felonnesse defoule *et confont* les rois redoutables jadis et *est si* decevable *que elle acravante les vainqueurs et* relieve humble voult du vaincu. Ne elle ne veult oir ne ne cure les chetis pleurs et *est si* dure *que* elle escharnist les *plains et* les gemissemens que elle leur a fais de son gré. Ainsi se jeue elle; ainsi espreuve elle ses forces et monstre grant miracle a ceulz qui l'aiment, quant aucuns est veuz beneuréz et mescheans en une meismes heure.

[PROSE II.]

Certes, je voudroie pledier un petit avec toi en usant des paroles de Fortune meismes. Regarde donques tu meismes, savoir mon, se elle requiert droit. "O tu homme, pour quoy me *blasmes tu et* fais coupable chascun jour par tes complaintes? Quel tort t'avons nous fait? Quiex bien t'avons nous toluz qui tiens fussent? Estrive avec moy devant quelconques juge que tu voudras de la possession des richesses et des dignitéz. Et se tu pues monstrer que aucun des mortiex hommes ait riens propre en ces chosez, je te otroieré ja de mon gré que les chosez que tu requiers ont esté teues. Quant (9*ra*) nature te trest hors du ventre de ta mere, je te reçui nu et souffreteus de toutez chosez et te norri de mes richesses et fui plus ententivement encline par ma grace a toy soustenir, par la quele chose tu es ores *rebelles et* sans pacience encontre moy; je t'avironné de l'abondance et de la resplendisseur de touz les biens qui sont de mon droit. Or me plaist a retraire ma main. Je t'ai fait grace quant tu as usé des chosez estranges; tu n'as pas droit de toy plaindre ainsi comme se tu eusses perdu tes chosez du tout. Pour quoi te plains tu donques? Je ne t'ai fait nulle violence *ne nul tort*. Richeces, honneurs, *dignitéz et puissances* et ces autres

---

55 tes: P^1 ces C^2 ses.
56 bouteroit: *b* bouteroient.
57 trouveroies en ta pensee: $P^3A^1A^2M$ compenseroies; entreuz: P^2DS *om.* $P^3A^1A^2M$ *after* brahains.
58 si: C^1BRb il.
60 tres: *b* plus tres; fols: P^1C^2 fors C^1 fo s (*with an erasure*).
61 delaisse: bC^1 delaissera.

METRE 1.

2 Eurupus: A^3P^4 en rupus; esboillans (BP^2): *D* esbouillans *RS* esboullans $P^3A^1A^2MP^4C$ esboulant (-ans) A^3 et boulans P^1C^2 escoulanz; *cours*: C^2 tours $P^3A^1A^2MD$ corps P^2 cors.
4 defoule: P^4 deboute.
7 *plains*: P^1 pains.
8 et . . . aiment: P^2DS *om.*; miracle: BP^4 *om.*; a ceulz: A^3P^4 asseus *B* assaux (A^3P^4: et demostre si grans asseus qui).

PROSE II.

1 voudroie: P^1 v. bien.
2 Regarde . . . meismes: P^1C^2 *om.*; savoir mon: *S* s. moult $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
3 "O tu: P^1C^2 o.
6 possession: P^1C^2 puissance.
9 te (trest): P^1 ce.
11 encline: *b* (*except D*) enclinee; a: P^1C^2 de.
12 ores: P^2DS *om.* *B* maintenant.
16 t'ai: P^1C^2 te.
17 honneurs: *R* *om.*
17-8 honneurs . . . chosez: A^1A^2M *om.*
17 *dignitéz*: P^2DS *om.*; *et*: C^1BR *om.*; *dign. et puissances*: P^3 *om.*; ces autres: P^3 toutes.

chosez telles sont de mon droit. Mes chamberierez cognoissent leur dame; elles viennent avec moy et, quant je me depart, elles se departent. Je ose bien hardiement afermer que, se les chosez dom tu te plains que tu les as perdues eussent onques esté teues, tu ne les eusses onques perdues en nulle maniere. Serai je donques deveee toute seule de user de mon droit?

Li cielx a bien *pooir et* lesir de faire les jours *biaus et* clers et de respondre les en nuiz tenebreusez. Li ans a bien lesir de aourner le voult de la terre aucune foiz de fleurs, aucune foiz de blez et de confundre le aucune fois de pluiez et de froiz. La mer a bien droit *et lesir* de estre aucune foiz soueve et plaine et de soi hericier aucune fois de floz et de tempestes. Mais la couvoitise des hommes, qui ne puet estre acomplie, nous liera elle, *moy et mes chamberieres,* a ce que nous soions *fermes et* estables comme estableté soit estrange a nos meurs? Telle est nostre force; de ce jeu jouons nous continuelment; nous (9*rb*) tournons une roe par rondece tournable, nous nous esjoissons a muer les basses chosez es hautes et les hautes es basses. Monte s'il te plaist, mes que ce soit par celle lai que tu ne cuides pas que je te face tort se tu descens quant la raison de mon jeu le requerra. Ne cognoissoies tu pas donques mes meurs? Ne savoies tu pas comme Cresus, le roi des Lidians, qui fu si redoubtables un pou devant au roi Cirus, qui puis tantost le prist chetif et l'envoia ardoir au feu, quant la pluie descendant du ciel l'en deffendi? Et ne es tu pas remembrant comme Paulus, quant il ot pris le roi de Perse, plora piteusement pour les chetivetéz de celui? Et quelle autre chose pleure li cris des tragedies fors seulement comme fortune tourne les riches royaumes par coup despourveu? N'as tu apris, des lors que tu fus enfés *et jeunes,* que dui tonnel dont li uns est plains de mal et li autres plains de bien, gisent ou sueil, *c'est a dire en l'entree de la meson Jupiter?* Que pues tu plaindre se tu as pris plus plenteureusement de la partie de mes biens? Et quoy avec, se je ne me sui pas toute departie de toi? Et quoy encores, se ceste moie muableté te donne droite cause de esperance de meilleurs chosez avoir? Et toutevoies pour ce que li cuers ne te faille, tu qui es mis dedens le royaume commun a touz, *c'est ou royaume de fortune,* veulz tu vivre selonc ton propre droit?

[METRE II.]

Se l'abundance, *la deesse des richeces,* donnoit aus hommes a plaine corne sans retraire sa main autant (9*va*) de richeces comme la mer tournoie poudres de graveles quant elle est esmeue par ravissable vent, ou autant

---

18 leur dame: P^1B leurs dames C^1 leur dames.

19 elles se departent: P^1 elle se depart.

19-20 Je ose . . . afermer: *B* je eusse . . . aferme.

20-1 que . . . perdues: P^1C^2 *om.*

22 deveee: A^1A^2M deuee P^2DS desvoie P^3 denyee C^1 desuable *BR* desusasse (*these latter read* se je *for* serai).

23 de (resp.): *b* (*except* P^3) *om.*

24 respondre (*DR*: repondre) les: P^3 les muces; en: *b* es (*B*: eñuis des tenebres C^1 enmis tenebres *M* es nues t-ses).

25-6 blez . . . de (pluiez): *DS om.*

25 le: P^1 les.

27 soueve: *b* (*except M*) souef.

29 *moy et mes chamberieres*: *b om. B* moy et mes chaiennes et mes chamberieres.

33 mes . . . soit: P^1C^2 *om.*; celle ($P^1C^2P^2$): *b* (*except* A^1P^2) *BR* tele C^1A^1 tel; lai: P^1C^2 la.

36 pas: P^1C^2 pas donques; comme: C^1BR-P^3A^1DS comment; le . . . Lidians: *b om.* C^1 li roys des dyaus; si: *b om.*; redoubtables: P^3 redoubte.

37 Cirus: C^1 Cyrus *BR* Syrus $P^3A^1A^2M$ Tyrus; chetif: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om. B* chetist (*BR*: qui puis le chetif prist tantost); au feu ($BC^1P^3A^1A^2$): P^1C^2 en feus P^2DR as feus *MS* aux feux (fus).

40 des tragedies: *b* des tragediens *R* destrange dieus.

41 riches: P^1C^2 r. et.

42 as tu: *b* as tu pas; enfés *et jeunes*: P^3A^2 enfant jeune P^3 enfes; dont: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*

43 gisent; *b* sieent (*M* seent *D* sient); gisent ou sueil: *BR om.*

44-5 *en l'*: C^2BADS a l' P^3 ou.

45 de mes: *b* des.

METRE II.

1 Se: P^3 de C^1P^4 ne; *la deesse*: P^1 la delaissie *DS om.* P^2 dame fortune (*superscript*: ou dame copie sc. habondance appellee la deesse; *marginal in another hand*: le deesse); donnoit: P^1C^2 donnant *B* donnans.

3 ravissable: P^1 raviable.

comme il resplendist ou ciel des estoilles luisans par les cleres nuiz, ja pour ce ne laisseroit li lignages des hommes a pleurer ses chetives complaintes. Et ja soit ce que diex reçoive volentiers leurs prieres et leur doint comme fol-larges moult grant moncel d'or et aourne leurs couvoitises de noblez honneurs, si leur semblera il que il n'ont encores riens aquis, mais leur cruele rapine devoranz les chosez aquises euvre encores sa gueule *et ses girons et bee a plus avoir d'autre part.* Quiex frains pourroient jamés retenir par certaine fin la couvoitise des hommes qui ne puet estre acomplie? Que, quant elle plus dequeurt de larges dons, de tant art plus en sus li desiriers de avoir. Certes nus homs n'est onques vivant riches qui tremble et gemist et cuide touz jours estre povres *et souffreteur.*

[PROSE III.]

Se Fortune donques parloit ainsi a toy pour soy, certainement tu n'auroies riens que tu peusses dire encontre; ou se tu as riens par quoy tu puisses par droit ta complainte deffendre, il convient que tu le dies. Nous te dorrons lieu de dire." Lors dis je: "Certainement beles sont ces chosez et sont *aournees et* enointes du miel de la douceur de rethorique et de musique; et tant dis comme elles sont oies, tant seulement delitent. Mais li chetis sentent plus hautement leurs maulz que leurs deliz. Si que, quant ces chosez cessent de sonner (9*vb*) en mes oreilles, la douleur qui s'est embatue dedens mon courage le confont *et li fait le delit oublier.*"

"Ainsi est", dist elle. "Mais ce ne sont pas li remede de ta maladie, mais ce sont aucuns norrissemens contre la curation de ta douleur encores orgueilleuse. Car, quant il sera temps, je ti ajusteray les chosez qui te tresperceront plus en parfont. Mais toutevois, pour ce que tu ne vueillez cuidier que tu soies chetis, as tu donques oublié le nombre et la maniere de ta beneurté? Je me tes de ce que, quant tu fus orphelins de pere et de mere, il plus noble homme *de la cité* te reçurent en leur garde et fus acueilli en l'affinité *et en la priveté* des princes de la cité, et leur commenças avant a estre chiers que prochiens, la quelle chose est la plus precieuse maniere de prochaineté qui soit. *Et de rechief* qui fu cil qui ne te *tint et* preescha pour tres beneuré, quant tu fus en si grant honesté de socres *et d'amis* et eus *si preude* fame et si chaste, et la joie que tu eus de tes enfans malles? Et pour ce que il me plaist a trespasser les communes chosez, je me tais encores de ce que tu receus en ta jeunece les dignitéz *et les honneurs* qui estoient deniees aus viellars et me delite en venir au sengle comblement de ta beneurté. Se aucuns fruiz des chosez mortiex puet avoir aucun pois *ou quelque valeur* de beneurté, pourras tu oublier, pour nulz faiz de maulz qui

---

5 chetives: P^1C^2 *om.*
7 fol-larges: $C^1P^2A^3$ fols larges *B* foulz larges P^3 foul large A^1A^2 fol large *S* follargue *D* faus larghue P^4 larges folz.
8 semblera il: P^1C^2 semblera; ont: BC^1 aient; (*b* semb. il encore qu'il n'ont . . .).
10 Quiex frains: P^1C^2 et q. f. P^4 quelz homs; pourroient (*b*): P^1C^2 porront C^1BRP^4 pourroit (*subject*: quel frain).
12 plus dequeurt: *b* (*except* P^3) *inverted* A^3P^4 p. decourt C^1 p. dekeuure P^3 dequeurt; art: P^1 art elle.
13 tremble: P^1C^2 ne tr.

PROSE III.

2 encontre: *DS* au contraire.
3 par droit: *b om.*
5 du miel de la: *b* de miel et de la.
6 tant dis comme: *BRb* (*except DS*) tandis c. *DS* toudis c. C^1 endementiers que.
8 s'est: *bB* est C^2 cest; embatue: *A* abbatue *B* enbaumee.
9 le conf. *et*: P^2 *om.*
13 plus: *bR om.*; ne: P^1B *om.*
15 que: P^1C^2 car; Je me tes: *B* souviegne toy.
16 homme: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*
17-8 et . . . prochiens: *B om.*
17 leur: *b* lors; avant: C^1 avoec *b* plus tost.
19 ne te *tint*: C^2P^2 ne tint *B* ne tente.
20 d' (*amis*): P^1C^2 *om.*
21 enfans: P^1C^2 deuz enf.
24 deniees: P^1 donnees C^2 doulces *M* deues (*erasure; the letters* ues *are of a more recent hand*); en: *B* de *b* (*except* P^2) a: au sengle (*BR*): $P^1C^2P^2$ en s. C^1D au saingle $P^3A^1A^2M$ au singulier *S* a la singulere; comblement: *S* acomblement *D* acromblement *B* acomplissement.
25 puet: P^2DS peust; pois (*Rb*): BC^1 pooir P^1C^2 pou.

t'aviennent *combien qu'il soit grans,* la remembrance d'ycelui jour, *c'est a savoir* quant tu veis tes deuz filz, faiz conseilliers, issir ensemble de ta maison avec l'asem- (10*ra*) blee des peres et la leesce du peuple et quant il furent assis *ou lieu commun* en la cort es siegez de leurs dignitéz? Tu, qui fus lors annoncierres *et prechierres* de la loenge du roy, deservis gloire *et renommee* de engin et de parole! Ce fu quant tu te seiz ou milieu de deuz conseilleurs et saoulas la multitude du peuple, atendant entour toy, de si large loenge comme on seult chanter aus victores. Je cuit que tu as deceue Fortune quant elle *te flaté et blandist et* t'asouagé ainsi, quant elle te norrist si deliteusement. Tu en as porté de elle tel don *et telle beneurté* que elle n'en avoit onques presté nul tel a nulle personne privee. Veulz tu donques conter a Fortune? Elle t'a ore premierement un petit regardé de mal euil. Se tu regardez bien le nombre et la maniere de tes leesces et de tes tristeces, encores ne pues tu pas nier que tu ne soies beneuréz. Et se tu cuidez que tu ne soies pas beneuréz pour ce que les chosez qui lors te sembloient estre liees et joieusez s'en sont alees, il n'est riens pour quoy tu doies cuidier estre chetis, car les chosez qui ores te semblent estre tristes s'en vont *et trespassent ainsi.*

Es tu ores premierement venus soudainz et hostes en la cortine *et en l'ombre* de ceste vie? Et cuidez tu que il ait point de estableté es chosez humaines, comme souvent en une heure isnele est homme meismes *depeciéz et* destruiz, *c'est quant l'ame se depart du corps?* Car se Fortune est neis *estable et* loyaus au mains aus beneuréz, la quelle chose a- (10*vb*) vient a tart, toutevois li darreniers jours de leur vie est une maniere de mort de Fortune, neis de celle qui a esté *estable et* parmanant. Quelle difference cuidez tu donques qu'il i ait? Car ou tu la laisseras en mourant ou elle te laissera en fuiant.

[METRE III.]

Quant li soleuz commence a espandre sa clarté par l'air, les estoilles deviennent palez et reboucheez de leurs biautéz pour la clarté du soleil qui les estaint. Quant li bois est *biaus et* couloréz de rosez de prin temps par le doulz vent Zephirus, se li occurs vens Auster vente felonnessement, la biauté des espinez s'en ira tantost. La mer est souvent clere par serine pesibleté sens esmouvement de floz; Aquilo *li horrible vent* y esmuet souvent tempestes esbouillans et tourne la mer ce desus desouz.

Se la forme du monde est ainsi a tart estable, se elle se trestorne par tant de muances, te veulz tu fier es fortunes muables des hommes, veulz tu

---

28 tes: P^1 des.

31 *et prechierres* (P^1C^1R; C^2 et prescheurs): *bB om.* (*B* tu qui anoncas lo loenge du roi).

32 te: *bB*C^1 *om.*

33 atendant (*bR*): *a* (*except R*) en tendant.

35 *blandist et* t': *bB om.*

36 deliteusement: *bBR* delicieusement.

36-7 Tu . . . privee: *S om.*

36 (de) elle: *BRb* (*except* A^2M) li A^2M lui.

37 nul . . . privee: P^1C^2 *om.*

38 premierement: *b om.*

41 lors te: *BR om.* P^2 leur te; te: *Cb* (*except* P^2) *om.*

42 sembloient: C^1 ressamblent (*i.e.* te samb.); tu: P^1 *om.*

43 doies cuidier: C^2 dois c. *B* cuides; estre tristes: P^1 tristes estrez C^1 tristres.

44 *ainsi*: $C^1P^2A^1A^2M$ aussi.

45 Es tu . . . venus: P^1 et tu . . . ueus estre C^2 es tu . . . estre ueuz.

46 *ombre*: *CBRb* (*except PD*) ombrage *PD* ombragete; ait: P^2DS y ait.

47 humaines: *DS* mondaines; est: P^1 et; homme: P^2DS un h.

48 *After* corps *there is a second gloss in* P^1C^2: donques se fortune qui ne dure gueres pouait demourer au meins a la mort s'enfuiroit elle.

50 a tart: P^1 a tort.

METRE III.

1 l'air: A^3P^4 *om.*

2 reboucheez: P^1 -chez; leurs biautéz pour: A^3P^4R *om.*

5 souvent clere: P^1C^2 *inverted;* par serine ($RP^3A^1A^2A^3M$): $C^1C^2BP^2P^4DS$ par ferme P^1 par an ferme (P^1 *is damaged at this spot*).

7 esbouillans (*R*): P^1C^2 *om.*; ce: A^3 sans; desus desouz: A^3P^4 *inverted* C^1 desous deseure.

8 forme: $P^1C^2P^2DS$ fortune.

mettre ta creance es biens fuitis? Certaine chose est et estable par loy pardurable que nulle chose engendree ne soit estable.

[PROSE IV.]

Lors dis je: "Tu, norrice de toutez vertuz, racontez veritéz ne je ne puis nier que ma beneurté n'ait eu cours tres isnel. Mes ce qu'il m'en remembre, c'est la chose qui plus desveement me tourmente. Car en toute la diverse contrarieté de fortune la tres maleureuse maniere de toutez les maleurtéz est avoir esté beneureus." "Mais ce que tu", dist elle, "comperes le tourment de fausse opinion, *c'est que tu cuidez avoir esté beneureuz,* ce ne pues tu mie par droit mettre sus aus chosez. (10*va*) Car se cist vains nons de fortunele beneurté te meut, conte avec moy *de tes beneurtéz,* tu en as bien loisir, *lors verras* que encores habondez tu de pluseurs beneurtéz et de tres grans. Se tu as doncques encore par la grace de dieu tout entier et sans apeticier ce que tu avoies tres precieus en tout le chastel de toutez tes richeces, te pourras tu par droit plaindre de maleurté, puis que tu retiens encores toutez les meilleurs chosez que tu eusses onques?

Certez encores vit sains *et haitiéz* cil qui est la tres precieuse honneur du lignage humain, Simachus tes socres, hom qui touz est faiz de sapience et de vertuz. Cestui n'achateroiez tu pas moins chier de ta vie meismes; il est seurs de ces injurez—*car nul ne li fait tort*—il se deult des tors qu'on te fait. Encores vit ta fame atrempee d'engin et seurloee de l'onneur de chastee et, pour ce que je encloe briefment toutez ses bontéz, elle est semblable a son pere. Elle vit, ce te di je bien, haineuse de ceste vie et te garde tant seulement son esperit et default en soi meismes par lermes *de corps* et par douleur *de cuer* pour le desirier de toy, en la quelle seule chose une je meismes neis otroi que ta beneurté soit amenuisie.

Pour quoy te diroie je de tes filz conseilleurs es quiex, aussi comme encores en enfans de cest aage, reluist ja la noblece de l'engin de leur pere ou de leur ayeul? Donques comme souveraine cure soit aus mortiex hommes de retenir leur vie, je di, se tu cognois tes biens, que tu es beneureus. Car encore te remaingnent neis ores les chosez des quiex nulz hom ne doubte (10*vb*) que tu ne les aies plus chieres que ta vie, *car se mestier leur iert, tu voudroies neis perdre ta vie pour eulz. Pour quoy te plains tu puis que tu as ta vie et chosez plus chieres que ta vie?* Seiche donques ja tes lermes, car Fortune n'est pas haineuse a toi du tout ne trop fort tempeste n'est pas cheue sus toy, quant les ancres tenables *de ta nef* s'aherdent encores qui ne seuffrent pas que comfort du temps present ne esperance du temps a venir te faillent." "Et je pri", dis je, "que elles se aherdent; car tandis comme elles durront, comment que les chosez se

---

10 es biens: *A*^{3} et loyers *P*^{4} es forains (?) biens.

PROSE IV.

2 cours: P^1C^2 corps; n'ait eu cours: C^2 vait en corps *B* n'ait encor; isnel: *B* vilz.

2-3 Mes . . . chose: P^1C^2 *om.*

2 m'en: BRP^3M me; remembre: *b* (*except* P^2) membre.

5 esté: P^1B estre; dist elle: P^1C^2 *om.* P^3 diz et le *R* dis elle.

7 mettre: C^1 avoir mis; vains nons: P^1 raieus (?) vous.

8 fortunele beneurté: P^1C^2 fortune beneuree *B* fortune de beneurte; conte: *DS* toute.

11 chastel: $C^2BRP^3A^1M$ chatel P^2 chastel (*s deleted*).

18 seurloee: P^1 -loe; chastee: $P^3A^1A^2M$ chastete *S* castete C^1D caaste P^2 chaste.

19 toutez: *b om.*; est semblable: *b* semble.

22 default: *DS* le deffent.

23 meismes neis: *b om.*; amenuisie: BP^2M amenuisiee.

26 comme: $P^1C^2P^2$ comment.

28 remaingnent: *D* r. et P^1 remaingne et.

29 chieres: P^1 chier C^2 chiers A^2 chers.

30 *iert*: C^1D ert BP^2S est $P^3A^1A^2M$ estoit; *Pour quoy*: P^1R par q. C^1C^2 per q.

30-1 *te plains tu*: *added from DS.*

31 *puis que*: *DS* quant; Seiche (P^2P^3-A^1A^2M): C^1 secque *S* se ce *BD* sache *R* saches P^1C^2 cesse.

32 ja: *S* je P^1C^2 de C^1 *om.*; a: P^1C^2 de; du tout: *b om. but replaced by*: et se elle het tous les autres, ne te het elle pas; trop: *b* tres.

33 cheue: P^1 trop ch.; quant: $P^3A^1A^2M$ car.

34 s'aherdent: P^1 se herdent.

36-7 se portent: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aillent.

portent, nous noerons oultre. Mais tu vois combien il fault de honneur a nos aournemens."

Et lors dist elle: "Nous t'avons aucun pou esmeu, s'il ne te poise pas ores de toute ta fortune. Mais je ne puis souffrir tes delices qui te complains si pleurans et si angoisseus de ce que aucune chose defaut a ta beneurté. Car quiex hom est de si planteureuse beneurté *qui ne se plaingne et* qui ne tence de quelque part contre la qualité de son estat? Car la condicion des biens humains est angoisseuse chose et telle que elle ne vient onques ensemble toute ou *se elle i vient,* elle n'i demourra jamés pardurable. Cil est habondans de avoir, mais il a honte de son bas lignage; cist est renommés de noblece de lignage, mais il est enclos en si grant angoisse de povreté que ce poise lui quant il est cogneu. Cist autres est richez et noblez, mais il pleure sa chaste vie, *car il n'a point de fame.* Cist est *bien mariés,* beneureus de noces; or n'a nulz enfans, si (11*ra*) norrist son avoir a estranges heirs. Li autres est liéz *et joieuz* de avoir enfans; si pleure dolans les forfaiz de son filz ou de sa fille. Pour ce ne s'acorde nul legierement a la condicion de sa fortune; car chascuns a quelque chose que il mescognoist pour ce que il ne l'a pas esprouvee ou en redoubte aucune pour ce que il l'a esprouvee. Et avec tout ce, pues tu ajuster que chascuns tres beneuréz a le sans tres delicieus *et tres mol;* et se toutez chosez ne li vienent a sa volenté, pour ce qu'il n'est acoustuméz d'avoir nulle adversité, il est acrevantés pour chascunes tres petites mescheances, si que les chosez sont moult petites qui tolent a tres beneurés la somme de beneurté. Mes quans hommes cuidez tu qui saient ou monde qui cuideroient estre grans presque jusquez au ciel, s'il avoient une tres petite partie des remenans de ta fortune? Cist meismes lieus, que tu apelez essil, est pais a ceulz qui y habitent; si que nulz homs ne est chetis s'il ne le cuide estre et, contre ce, toute fortune est beneuree, *mais que elle soit prise en gré, c'est a dire* par l'igaulté de courage du souffrant.

Qui est cil tant beneuréz que, quant il a perdu pacience, ne desire a muer son estat? De maintes *et de moult grans* amertumes est arrousee la douceur de la beneurté humaine. Et qui neis se elle semble joieuse a celui qui en use, toutevois ne puet elle pas estre retenue que elle ne s'en aille quant elle voudra. Or apert donques comment est chetive la beneurté des mortiex chosez qui ne dure mie pardurable a ceulz qui toute fortune reçoivent ilgaument, ne ne delite pas toute les angoisseuz. O vous mortel homme, pour quoy queréz vous donquez (11*rb*) hors de vous beneurté qui est mise dedens vous meismes? Erreur et folie vous confont.

Je te monstrerai briefment le commencement *et la force* de la souveraine beneurté *mondaine.* Est il nulle chose que tu *plus aimes et* tiengnes pour

---

39 s'il: *bBR* si; te: P^1 *om.*
40 qui te: P^1C^2 que tu; *From* "complains" *to* "estre et" *of line 63* A^2 *(fol.* 39^r *to fol.* 40^r*—exactly two pages) has a different reading.*
42 Car . . . beneurté: *B om.*
44 elle: *bB* ou elle.
45 *se:* P^1 ce; *vient: repeated twice in* P^1C^2.
46 a: P^1 ha; bas: P^1C^2 poure b. *R* propre bas.
48 quant (*b*): *a* dom (dont) C^1 *quant;* cogneu: C^1BRb cogneu ou (C^1BR) qu'il voudroit miex estre mescogneus; autres: *b om.* P^1C^2 li aut.
49 beneureus: *b om.*
49-50 Cist . . . heirs: *S om.*
50 a: P^1C^2 en.
52 ou: P^1 et.
53 a: P^1C^2 *om.*
54 ou: P^1C^2 or; ou . . . esprouvee: *R om.*
55 sans: P^1 san C^2 sanc; tres (delic.): BP^3DS trop.
56 *tres:* $bBRC^1$ trop; viennent: P^1C^2 venoient BC^1 avenoient.
57 n'est: *b* n'est pas; est: P^1C^2 *om.*
58 chascunes: P^1 chascuns.
60 saient: P^1 saies C^2 soies *B om.*; presque: P^1C^2 pres.
61 des remenans: *b om.*
62 pais: P^1 paix.
63 s'il: $P^1C^2A^1S$ si.
64 de courage: *a om.*
67-8 la douceur (*R* douleur) de: P^1C^2 *om.*
68 humaine: *b* mondaine.
70 chetive: P^1C^2 joieuse.
72 toute les angoisseuz: *corr. from* P^3 *for* toutez les angoissez.
73 vous beneurté: P^1 vos beneurtez.
75-6 souver. beneurté: P^1C^2 *invert.*

plus chiere que toy meismes? Tu respondras: "Nenin". Donques se tu es *bien et resonnablement* ordeneur de toy, tu auras ce que tu ne voudras jamés perdre ne Fortune ne le te pourra tolir. Et pour ce que tu cognoisses que beneurté ne puet estre en ces chosez fortuneles *et temporiex*. entens ce si comme je le te dirai. Se beneurté est li souverain bien de nature vivant par raison, ne ce n'est pas souverain bien qui par aucune maniere peut estre tolu—car miex vaut *et plus digne chose est* ce qui ne puet estre tolu—c'est chose aperte que la muableté de fortune ne puet ataindre a beneurté recevoir. Et encores, cil qui ceste escouloriable beneurté *soutient et* porte, ou il set que elle est muable ou il ne le set pas. S'il ne set, quele fortune puet estre beneuree en l'avugleté de ignorance? (*c'est puis qu'il en est avugléz et mescognoissans*). S'il le set, il convient que il ait paour que il ne perde ce dont il est certain que il puet estre perdu: par quoy la continuee paour ne le laisse point estre beneuréz. Ou se il l'a perdue, il en cuide estre cheuz en despit *et en vilté?* Certainement ainsi est ce si petiz biens que on le doit aussi igaulment porter en son cuer quant on l'a perdu *comme quant on le tenoit*. Et pour ce que tu meismes es cis a qui il a esté amonnesté et mis en cuer par maintes demonstraisons, si comme je le sai, que les ames des hommes ne sont (11*va*) en nulle maniere mortiex, et comme ce soit aperte chose que la fortunele beneurté se defenist par la mort du corps, nulz ne puet doubter, se ceste beneurté fortunele puet aporter beneurté, que touz li humains lignages ne descende en chetiveté par la fin de la mort. Et se nous savons que maint homme ont quis le fruit de beneurté non mie tant seulement par mort, mais neis par douleurs et par tourmens, comment pourroit ceste presente *vie* faire les hommes beneuréz, quant elle meismes ne les fait pas chetis quant elle est trespassee?

[METRE IV.]

Quiconques sages homs voudra fonder a soi maison *forte et* pardurable et voudra si estables estre qu'il ne puisse estre acravantéz par les horriblez soufflemens des venz, et cure *et veult* despire la mer et les menaces de ses floz, ne face pas sa maison ou sommet de la haulte montaingne ne es moistez sablons. Li felon vent tourmente le sommet de la montaingne de toutez ses forces; li sablon mol ne puent porter le fais. Ainsi se tu veulz foir la perilleuse aventure du delitable siege pour estre certains *et seurs*, fonde ta maison en une *petite* basse roche. Ja soit ce que li vens tonne et trouble les planices de la mer par trebuchances de floz, tu seras couvers en

---

77 chiere: P^1 chierez; respondras: *b* diras.
78 ordeneur (P^1C^2B): C^1R ordenierres P^2 ordenez *DS* ordennes A^1A^2 ordene P^3M ordonne.
79 ne (le te): P^1 *om.*
81-2 de nat. . . . bien: A^2 *om.*
82 ne: bP^1C^2 *om.*
83-4 car . . . tolu: P^1C^2 *om.*
84-5 puet ataindre: P^2 ateindra.
87 S'il ne set (*B*): P^1P^2 si ne set C^1C^2R s'il non set *b* (*except* P^2) se il ne le scet.
89 paour (BC^1b; *A* pour): P^1 pooir C^2 pouair *R* pouour; dont: P^1C^2 don.
90 continuee: P^1 continue P^2DS continuel: paour: *R* pouour BC^1b douleur; le: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*
91 *et*: *b* ou; ainsi: *b* aussi C^2 *om.*
92 cuer: $P^3A^1A^2M$ couraige.
95 le: $P^1C^2P^2$ les.
96 comme: P^1 comment que C^2 comment; la: P^1C^2 *om.*
98 descende: P^1C^2 descendent.
99 par la fin de la mort: *b* de mort a (P^2DS en) la fin.
101 ceste: P^1 cest.

METRE IV.

1 *forte*: *the rest* fort.
3 *veult* (aA^3P^4; C^2 vieult): P^3 vueille A^2 veuille P^2 voille A^1M vuille *DS* veule.
4 maison: P^1C^2 mais. ou donjon ne *B* mais. ou son ne.
4-5 haulte . . . la: A^3 *om.*; es moistes, *etc.*: *different reading in* P^2.
5 montaingne: *b* (*except* P^2) haulte m.
6 li: *DS* et li; mol ($P^1C^1P^2DS$): C^2A^2M molz A^1 mos P^3 mouls P^4 moiste *B* moistes; puent: $P^1P^2A^3P^4$ puet *S* poet; Ainsi: $P^1C^1P^2P^3A^1M$ aussi; se: P^1 ce.
7 certains *et seurs*: *b inverted.*
8 *petite* basse roche (P^1C^2): *b* petite r. RA^3P^4 basse ou p. rochete *B* p. et basse voutelete C^1 petite vautete.
8-9 tonne et trouble (*R*): BA^3P^4 donne et t. $P^1C^2C^1S$ tourne et trouble (tourble) P^3A^1 estrouble *M* e trouble A^2 trouble.
9 planices (*Rb*): *BS* planites A^3 planeites C^2 plaineittes P^4 planettes P^1 plaieites C^1 plaintes.

repos et beneuréz par la force de ton paliz et demeneras en paix ton aage en escharnissant les ires *et les forseneriez* de l'air.

[PROSE V.]

Mais pour ce que li norrissement de mes raisons descendent ja en toy, je cuit que bon seroit user de medecines un petit plus fors. Or entens ici se li don de For- (11*vb*) tune ne fussent ore pas decevable et defaillant, quel chose a il en eus qui onques puisse estre faite ou vostre ou qui ne soit tenue pour vil, se elle est bien clerement regardee et cogneue? Richeces sont elles precieuses ou par la nature de vous ou par la nature de elles meismes? Et des richeces la quele vaut miex? Est ce or ou force de deniers assembléz? Certes ces chosez resplandissent miex *et rendent plus nobles et miex renomméz* les despendeurs que les amonceleurs, car avarice fait touz jours *les avers* haineus et largece *les donneurs* nobles *et améz.* Et se ce qui est transporté de l'un a l'autre ne peut demourer avec chascun, donques est lors premierement peccune precieuse quant elle est transportee es autres et delaisse a estre eue par usage de largement donner *de celui qui donnee l'a, c'est a dire quant cil qui l'avoit avant l'a donnee aus autres.* Mais se toute la peccune que toutez les gens du monde ont estoit donnee a un seul homme, elle feroit les autres souffreteus de soy meismes. Et certes une meismes vois toute, *sens estre amenuisiee,* raemplist ensemble les oreilles de mains hommes, mais vos richeces, se elles ne sont amennuisieez, ne puent ensemble trespasser a pluseurs. Et quant elles passent, il convient que elles facent povres ceulz que elles delaissent. O moult sont donques richeces estraintes et souffreteusez quant plusieurs ne les peuent pas toutez avoir ne elles ne peuent pas venir a chascun de touz sans la povreté des autres. Et la resplendisseur des gemmes *que on apele pierres precieusez* ne atret elle pas les yeux des hommes? Mais cer- (12*ra*) tes s'il a riens de bel et de bon en ceste resplendisseur, celle clarté est des pierres et non pas des hommes; dom je me merveil trop forment de ce que li homme *loent et* merveillent ces chosez *et les tiennent a precieusez.* Car quelle chose est sens mouvement et sens joincture d'ame et de corps qui par droit puisse resembler estre bele a creature qui en soy a ame et raison? Car ja soit ce que elles traient a eus aucune chose *ou aucun pou* de la derreniere biauté du monde par l'entente du createur et par la division de elles meismes, toutevois, pour ce que elles sont mises au desouz de vostre noblece, elles ne deservoient en nulle maniere que vous les deussiés merveillier. Et la biauté des chans ne vous delite elle pas moult?"

"Pour quoy ne nous deliteroit elle donques? Car c'est une bele partie de

---

10 demeneras: $P^2P^3A^2MD$ demorras $A^1A^3P^4B$ demourra.

PROSE V.

1 raisons: *b* paroles; descendent: $P^1C^1C^2$ descent *B* descendant A^2 sont A^1M *om.*

2 cuit: $C^1P^3A^1A^2M$ croy; plus fors: P^1 fors *DS* plus fortes.

3 ore pas: *R* ore mie bC^2 pas ores BC^1 pas.

4 ou vostre: *R* ou nostre *B* ou rostee A^2 ou bien C^1 nostre *DS* vostre P^1C^2 *om.*; qui: P^1 qu'il.

5 bien: *b* *om.*

6 de elles (*b*): *a* d'euz.

9 despendeurs: $P^3A^1A^2M$ donneurs C^1 les pendeurs *DS* espardeurs P^2 espandues.

9-10 touz jours: bC^1 *om.*

11 a: *b* en.

13 usage: *b* l'usage.

14 *l'a* (*don.*): P^1 *om.*

16 feroit: P^1C^2R fera.

17 meismes vois (C^1BR): *b* seule v. P^1C^2 meismes.

18 se elles: A^1 se elle P^1 sel *R* sil.

20 povres: P^1 *om.*; elles: P^1 elle.

21 estraintes (P^1C^2): *the rest* estroites.

22 chascun: P^1 chascune.

24 s'il a: *b* s'il i a *R* se il ia *with i of* ia *exmunged.*

27 merveillent: *b* se m. de.

29 resembler: *DS* sambler; bele: P^1C^2 tele; a (creat.): A^1A^2B *om.*; en soy a: *b* a en soi; Car: *b* que.

30 eus: *DS* elles.

31 la: P^1 *om.*; la division: C^1 le deviser.

32 pour: P^1 *om.*

33 deservoient (P^1C^2R): *b* desservent BC^1 deserviroient.

35 ne . . . donques: P^3 non; bele: $P^3A^1A^2M$ tres b.

la tres belle euvre *de cest monde.* Ainsi nous soulons nous esjoir de la face de la mer quant elle est serie; aussi merveillons nous le ciel et le soulail et la lune et les estoilles."

"Apartient donques a toy nule chose de cestes? Pour quoy te oses tu glorifier en la resplendisseur d'aucunes chosez ytelles? Es tu diversefiéz *et fes beaus* par les fleurs en prin temps? Est donques teue la planteureuseté des fruiz en esté? Pour quoy yes tu ravis par vaines joies? Pour quoy embraces tu les biens estranges pour les tiens? Jamais ne fera Fortune que ycelles chosez soient teues que la nature des chosez a fait estre estranges de toy. Certes li fruit des terres sont deu sans doubte aus norrissemens des bestes. Mais se tu veulz raemplir ta souffreté, selonc ce que il suffist a nature, il n'est pas raison que tu quierez habondance (12*rb*) de fortune, car pou de chosez et tres petites suffisent a nature. Et se tu veulz *raemplir et* contraindre la saouleté de nature de outrageuses chosez, ou ce que tu y ajusteras ne sera pas joieus ou il sera nuisanz. Cuidez tu ores ce que soit bele chose de ton corps *atourner et* faire le resplendissant de diversez robez, des quiex robez se la biauté en est agreable par regart, je *loeré et* merveilleré en eus ou la nature de la matiere ou l'engin de l'ouvrier. Mais longue compaignie de serjans te fait elle estre beneureus? Li quel s'il sont corrumpu de malvaises meurs, il sont destruiable charge de la maison et forment anemie au seigneur meismes; et s'il sont loyal *et preu*, estrange proece comment sera elle mise ou nombre de tes richeces? Si que, par toutez ces chosez *devant dites* est il bien clerement monstré que nulle de ces chosez que tu contez en tes biens, il n'y a nul bien qui soit tiens. Es quiex chosez s'il n'y a riens de biauté que on doie requerre, quelle raison as tu ou de toy doloir se tu les pers ou de toy esjoir se tu les retiens? Et se *tu dis qu*'elles sont beles de leur propre nature, que t'en apartient il, *que te profite ce?* Car aussi bien eussent elles esté plaisans par eus meismes, se elles fussent departies de tes richeces. Ne par ce que elles sont venues a tes richeces, pour ce sont eles precieuses, mes pour ce qu'eles sembloient estre precieuses, par ce les vousisses tu metre ou nombre de tes richeces.

Mais *que aléz vous querant ou* que desiréz vous par si grant estroiz *ou par si grant haste* de Fortune? Je croi que vous queréz chacier vostre pouvreté par l'abondance de ces chosez. Mais certes li contraire de ce vous en avient, car de pluseurs aidez *et de pluseurs serjans* a on mestier a garder *et a deffendre* la diversité de precieus avoir. (12*va*) Et si rest ce veritéz: cil qui trop plus ont sont souffreteus de trop plus de chosez et, encontre ce, moins sont souffreteus cil qui *soupoisent et* mesurent leur habondance par

---

37-8 le ciel . . . estoilles: $P^3A^1A^2M$ c. e. l. s. BR c. e. s. l. C^1 c. e. l.; le soulail et la lune et: P^2DS *om.*

39 apartient: P^1C^2 ap. il; chose de cestes (P^1C^2R): C^1P^2DS de ces choses $P^3A^1A^2M$ de ces ch. itelles B tele chose.

39-40 Pour . . . ytelles: A^1A^2M *om.*

39 Pour quoy: P^1C^2 pour P^3 ne; te: P^1C^2 ce S tu.

40 chosez ytelles: P^3 de ces choses P^2DSBRC^1 des ch. it.; Es: $P^1C^2A^1A^2M$ et.

41 *fes beaus* (feis biaus): P^1 fesseaus C^2 fes seaus P^3A^2 fait bel A^1 fait belle.

42 yes (P^1C^2): A^1 estez *the rest* es; joies: bB gloire.

43 quoy: P^1 *om.*

45 deu: P^1C^2 dieu P^3MR deuz B dehus.

46 tu: P^1C^2 *om.*

50 y: P^1C^2 *om.*: sera pas: P^1 seras p.

51 *atourner*: $bBRC^1$ aourner (aorner).

54 compaignie: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ordre; te: P^1 de.

55 sont (corr.): P^1C^2 ont; malvaises (mauveses): P^1C^2 malvais; destruiable: P^1 destrivable A^1 destríuable A^2 estrivable DS destruisable.

57 estrange: P^1 estrance.

59 contez: DS cognois; soit: P^2DS soient; Es: P^1BRC^1 et.

60 riens: S nient D mout.

61 les (pers): P^1DS le P^3 la; les (ret.): DS le P^3 la.

62-3 *que te . . . ce*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

63 bien: P^3 biens; elles: P^1C *om.*

64-6 Ne . . . ou nombre de tes rich.: P^1C^2B *om.*

65 sont eles: *editor's correction for* ne sont eles pas.

66 vousisses: R vousis C^1DS vausis.

67 desiréz: P^1B desiries.

70 car: $P^1C^1C^2B$ et.

71 rest ce veritéz: DS reste verites que.

72 trop: b *om.*; encontre: P^1C^2 entre.

73 souffreteus cil: $P^3A^1A^2DSBR$ *inverted*; cil: R si.

la necessité de nature, non mie par l'outrage de couvoitise. Si n'avéz vous nul bien propre ne naturelment assis en vous, par quoy vous doiés querre vos biens es chosez foraines et de vous dessevrees? Mais or est ainsi bestournee la condicion des chosez, si que a homme qui est beste divine par la merite de raison, il ne li est pas avis que il soit biaus *ne nobles* fors que par la possession des chosez qui n'ont nulles ames. Et certes les autres bestes *qui n'ont nulle raison* se tiennent apaiees de leur propre biauté; mais vous hommes, qui estes semblablez a dieu par vostre raisonnable pensee, couvoitiéz *et queréz* des chosez bassez *et vilz* les aournemens de vostre noble nature ne n'entendéz pas com grant tort vous faitez a vostre createur. Il voult que li lignages humains vausist miex *et fust plus noblez* que nullez des chosez terriennes; et vous boutéz vostre dignité au desouz de toutez chosez tres bassez. Car se touz li biens de chascune chose est plus precieus que la chose meismes de cui li biens est, quant vous jugiéz que les tres vilz chosez sont vos biens, vous sommetéz vous meismes par vostre jugement aus chosez tres vilz et certez ce vous avient a bon droit. Car telle est la condicion de la nature humaine que elle soit noble seur ces autres chosez tant seulement lors quant elle se cognoist et que elle meismes soit ramenee desouz des bestez quant elle (12*vb*) faut a soy cognoistre. Car, a ces autres bestes, mescognoistre eus meismez il leur vient de nature; mais aus hommes il leur vient de vice. Mais comment apert ici largement vostre folie qui cuidiéz que riens puisse estre aourné *ne enbeli* de estranges aournemens! Mais ce ne puet estre fait. Car s'il y a riens des chosez ajusteez qui luise, certez les chosez qui sont ajustees sont loees; et la chose de ce couverte et reposte dessous remaint toutevois durant en sa propre ordure *que elle avoit avant.*

Mais certez je reni bien *et di* que nulle chose n'est bonne qui nuist a celui qui l'a. Ment je donques? Tu diras que non. Certez richeces ont neu souvent a ceulz qui les avoient, comme chascun tres mauvais—et par sa mauvaistié plus couvoiteus des richeces estranges—cuide que il fust tres dignes *et li mieudres hom du monde* s'il eust et d'or *et d'argent* et de pierres precieusez toutez les richeces qui sont par tout le monde. *Dom il avient souvent que cilz qui les richeces ont en sont souvent tuéz.* Tu donques qui es ores curieus et redoubtez glaives et maçues, se tu fusses antrés vuis de richeces ou sentier de ceste vie, tu chantassez seurs devant le larron. O moult est ore *precieuse et* noble la beneurté des richeces mortiex que, quant tu l'auras aquise, tu delaissez a estre seurs.

[METRE V.]

Trop furent beneuré li homme du premier aage. Il se tindrent apaiés des

74 Si n'avez vous (P^1C^2R): bBC^1 si que vous n'avez (A^1 si que n'avez).
75 naturelment assis (*a*): *b* (*except M*) nature n'a neant as. *M* nature n'a riens assiz.
77 beste: *DS* cose.
79 possession: P^1 condicion.
83 entendéz: P^1 entendent.
85 li biens . . . est: P^1C^2 les biens . . . est P^3 les biens . . . sont.
87 cui: *b* quoi (*D* coy) C^1C^2B qui.
90 ces: bC^2 toutes.
91 meismes: *b om.*
92-3 Car . . . mescognoistre: *DS om.*
94 vice: bBC^1 leur v.
95 puisse: P^1 ne p.
96 ce ne puet estre fait: P^1C^2 ce puet estre; s'il: P^1 cil.
97 qui sont: $P^1C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.* *R* qui est.
98 dessous: P^1C^2 *om*; toutevois: P^3 tous jours.
100 reni: *DS* r. ce estre; bonne: *b* bele.
101 qui l'a: P^1C^2 *om.*; Ment je: C^2 menge P^1 men je P^3 mentz je (*B*: mais ie di donques); neu ($P^1C^2P^2A^1A^2$): P^3 nuy *M* nuyt C^1DS nuisi *B* nuist; ont neu: *R* nõnt.
102 et: $P^1C^2P^3$ *om.* C^1 est.
104 *mieudres* (RCP^2S): *D* miudres P^1 mendres C^2 maindres *B* meudres $P^3A^1A^2M$ meilleur.
104-5 s'il . . . monde: *B om.*
104 et (d'or): *b om.*
107 fusses: P^1 fussent.
109 richeces: P^2DS choses.

METRE V.

1 apaiés: P^3 contens.

viandez que li loyal champ leur aportoient. Il ne se destruistrent pas par outrage qui fait les hommes *mauvais et* pereceus. Quant il avoient longuement jeuné, il mengoient les glans des boiz. (13*ra*) Il ne savoient faire buvrage de miel ne de vin ne taindre les blanchez toisons des Sirians par diversez couleurs *entrans comme venim.* Il se dormoient sus les herbes et bevoient des courans ruisseaus et gesoient es ombres des haus pins. Nulz hostes ne tranceit encores par avirons la haute mer ne n'avoit veu nouviaus rivagez pour mener merceries concueilliez en divers lieus. Lors se tesoient felonnessez boisines, ne sanc espandu par aigres haines n'avoit onques ensanglanté les horribles chans. Car pour quoy vousist forsenans anemis premierement armes esmouvoir, comme il veist les plaies crueusez ne n'y aperceust nul loier du sanc espandu?

Je voudroie que nos temps retournassent orendroit es meurs anciens. Mais l'angoisseuse couvoitise de avoir art en nous plus crueusement que li feu de la montaigne Ethna *qui touz jours art.* Ha las! qui fu cil qui premier *trest et* deffoi les massez d'or couvert souz la terre et les pierres precieusez qui se vouloient repondre? Cist *traist et* deffoi aus hommes perilz precieus.

[PROSE VI.]

Mais que te diraie je de dignitéz et de puissances les quiex vos, qui ne cognoissiéz vraie dignité ne vraie puissance, les ellevéz jusques au ciel? Les quiex se elles sont donnees a aucun tres mauvais, elles donront si grans agraventeures *et si grans domages* que nulz feus ne nulz deluges ne les donroit si grans. Certez bien te remembrez, si comme je cuit, que *celle dignité que on apeloit* l'empire consulaire, qui avant avoit esté commencement de franchise, vostre ancien Romain la couvoitierent a effacier pour l'orgueil des conseilleurs. Cil meismes ancien avoient avant osté de la cité (13*rb*) le nom royal pour cel orgueil meismes. Mes se ces dignitéz et ces puissances sont aucune foiz donnees aus bons hommes, la quelle chose on voit trop pou avenir, quelle autre chose a il en elles *bele et* plaisant fors que seulement la proece de ceulz qui en usent? Ainsi est il fait que honneur ne vient pas aus vertuz de la dignité, mais de vertu vient honneur aus dignitéz. Mais quiex est ceste vostre puissance si requerable et si tres noble? Ne regardéz vous pas, o vous bestes terriennes, seur quiex choses il semble que vous aiéz poir *quant vous estes esleu aus puissances recevoir?* Se tu veoies orez entre les souriz aucune souriz une chalongent a soi droiture *et seignorie* et puissance sus les autres souriz, de con grans

---

3-4 longuement (aA^3P^4): *b* longe (longue) piece (A^2 grant p.).
4 mengoient: P^1 menguent C^1C^2 menioient.
5 Sirians (-ens): A^1A^2M Syriens C^1 Serians A^3P^4 Sergens *B* desirrans (*i. e.* des Sirians) *D* disiriers.
6 *entrans*: A^3 entraíz.
7 des (cour.): *b* les *B* de; ruisseaus: P^1 ruisseus.
8 tranceit: BRC^1b trenchoit (tran-) *S* trent; n'avoit (BC^1): P^1C^2 avoit bRA^3P^4 n'avoient.
9 mener: P^1C^2 mettre *b. om.*; concueilliez: *b* concueillir C^2 concueilliees.
10 boisines (C^2): P^1 boisies *B* voisines C^1Rb buisines.
11 ensanglanté: P^3 taint.
11-2 forsenans anemis (*according to* C^1 *and* Bk. I, Metre IV, l. 8): $P^1C^2BRP^4$ forseneus a. *b.* aucuns forsenez.
12 veist (b): aA^3 veissent.
13 aperceust (P^1C^2b): BRC^1P^4 aperceussent.
16 Ethna: *b* de E.; premier: *b* premierement; *trest*: P^3 trahy.
17 deffoi: P^3 desfouy P^4 de fouir *S* descouvri *D* descouvrir.
18 repondre: $P^1A^2A^3$ respondre P^3 mucier; *et* deffoi: *b om.* A^3 et defouit.

PROSE VI.

1 quiex: P^1C^2 *om.*; ne: P^1 *om.*
5 cuit: $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy.
6 *apeloit*: *Bb* apele; esté: *b om.*
8 osté: A^1A^3 hoste P^1C^2 *om.*
9 et: P^1C^2 ou.
11 autre chose . . . *bele et* plaisant: P^1C^2B autre ch. . . . beles et plaisans C^1 autres c. . . . beles.
12 il: P^1C^2 *om.*
15-6 seur . . . pooir: *R om.*
16 semble: *b* vous s.
17 chalongent: C^1R chalengant *B* chalengast *b* (*except* P^3) chalengier P^3 atribuer.
18 de con (com): *D* de ton *S* coment bien C^2 de P^1 deuz.

escharnissemens seroies tu esmeus! *Certez aussi est il de vous que li vilz hommes ont seigneurie sus les vilz hommes, c'est a dire li corps sus les corps.* Car se tu regardez le corps de l'omme, quelle chose pouras tu trouver plus faible de l'omme? Souvent certez le tuent *selonc le corps* ou li mors de aucunes mouchetez ou l'entree de aucunes bestes rampans en aucuns lieus secréz. Mais ou sera trouvé aucun homme qui puisse seur aucun autre homme hanter aucun droit fors seulement sus le corps et sus les chosez plus basses du corps, les quelles je apele fortuneles possessions? Pourras tu jamais avoir *seigneurie ou* commandement sus franc corage? Osteras tu de l'estat de son propre repons la pensee qui *se tient et* se ahert a soi meismes par ferme raison? Comme un tyrant cuidast contraindre par tourmens un franc homme, pour ce que il li regehisist les consachablez de une conjuracion faite contre lui, cil mordi sa langue et la geta ou visage du forseneus tyrant; si (13*va*) que les tourmens, dom le tyrant cuidoit faire matiere de crualté, li sages homs les fist estre matiere de vertu.

Mais quelle chose est ce que chascun puisse faire a autrui que il ne puisse recevoir de autrui, ce meismes en soy? Nous avons oi que Bissyris souloit tuer ses hostes; Herculez, ses hostez, le tua. Regulus aussi avoit mis en liens pluseurs des Aufricanz par lui pris en bataille, mais tantost li vaincu le repristrent et li lierent les mains de leurs chaenes. Cuidez tu donques que cil soit puissans qui n'a pooir de faire que autre ne puisse faire en lui ce que il puet en autrui. Et encores s'il eust rien de bien es dignitéz et es puissances qui fust naturiex et propres, elles ne vendroient jamais aus tres mauvais hommes, car chosez contraires ne se seulent pas entreacompaignier; nature refuse que chascunes chosez contrairez se conjoignent. Si que, comme nous soions certains que li tres mauvais hommes tiennent plus souvent les dignitéz, il y apert neis par leur nature que elles ne sont pas bonnes qui se seuffrent a acompaignier aus tres mauvais. Et ce meismes certez poons nous *miex et* plus dignement jugier de tous les dons de fortune qui plus plenteureusement viennent a chascun tres mauvais *que aus bons hommes.* Des quiex dons je cuit que ce devons nous regarder, que nulz homs ne doubte que cil ne soit fors a cui il voit que force est venue, et a quiconques est isneleté venue, *certaine* chose est et aperte que cil est isneaus. Aussi fet musique les musiciens et medecine les mires et rethorique les rethoriens. Car la nature de chascune chose fait ce qui propre li est ne (13*vb*) ne se melle pas aus faiz de contrairez chosez et de son gré chace hors les chosez qui contrairez li sont. Mais certes ne richeces ne peuent pas restraindre l'avarice des hommes qui ne puet estre saoulee; ne puissance ne fera pas que cil soit puissans de bien ordenner soi

---

19-21 *certez . . . les corps*: *S om.*
19 *vous* (C^1C^2PDM): $BRP^1P^3A^1A^2$ nous.
20 *ont . . . hommes*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
23 de aucunes bestes: *b* des b. BRC^1 de b.
25 homme: *b om.*; hanter: *B* haut *D* hauteur.
25-6 et . . . du: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ou ce qui est dedens.
28 repons: *the rest* repos (repoz).
30 regehisist: *b* regehist *R* reíehist *S* gehist.
31 mordi: *D* morst C^1 mort.
32 le tryant: $C^1C^2RP^2DS$ li tryans.
33 les: P^1 le P^3 *om.*; matiere: P^1 martire.
35 de autrui: P^1C^2 de autre C^1 *om.*; Bissyris (P^1C^2): *bR* Busiris C^1 Buisiris *B* Boisius; souloit: *B* vouloit.
36 (tuer) ses: P^1 les; avoit: P^1 *om.* C^2 fu.
37 liens: P^1 lens *D* lins *R* lians.
41 tres: *b om.*
44 hommes: P^2DS *om.*
45 y: BRC^1b *om.*
47 *et* (plus): P^1C^2 *om.*
49 *hommes*: *b om.*
51 quinconques est ($BRP^2DSP^3A^1A^2$): *M* quelconques est C^2 qui donques est P^1 qui est donques C^1 p'mes est.
51 *certaine* chose est et aperte: P^2DS certainement $P^3A^1A^2M$ certaine chose est.
52 Aussi: C^2BR ainsi; fet: P^1 est C^2 et; musiciens: C^1 medicines; et (medicine) . . et (reth.): BRC^1b *om.* *S*: med . . . et r.
52-3 mires et rethorique: BC^1 mires especials reth.
53 chose: P^1C^2 *om.*; qui: $P^1BC^1P^3A^1M$ que A^2 *om.*
54 faiz: P^3 effectz.
55 chace: P^1C^2 sache C^1DS cache; Mais: P^1C^2 deniers C^1: et nous certes nos ricetes.
56 restraindre: $P^1C^2BC^1$ contraindre.
57 ordenner (BRC^1): P^1C^2 demener *b* aorner; soi: *b* lui (P^2 li).

meismes que mauvaisez *volentéz et* charniex couvoitisez retiennent estraint par chaenes qui ne peuent estre desliees. Et dignité donnee aus mauvais tant seulement ne les fait elle pas dignes, ainçois demonstre plus apertement qu'il ne sont pas dignes. Et pour quoy avient il ainsi? Certez pour ce que vous vous esjoissiés en nomer les chosez par faulz noms qui sont d'autre nature que vous ne leur mettéz assuz, si comme il est legierement prouvé par le fait de ces chosez meismez; si que ne celles richeces ne peuent mie par droit estre apelees richeces ne celle puissance ne peuet estre apelee puissance ne celle dignité dignité. Au derrenier ce meismes poons nous conclurre de toute maniere de fortune en la quelle il est bien aparant qu'il n'i a nulle chose que on doie requerre ne qui point ait en soy de vaine bonté, quant elle ne se joint pas tous jours aus bons ne ne fait pas bons ceulz a qui elle est conjointe.

[METRE VI.]

Nous avons bien cogneu com grans domagez *et com grans agraventeurez* fist *l'empereur Neron*. Il fist ardoir la cité de Romme et fist ocirre les senateurs et fist ocirre son frere et *despecier fist* sa mere *par membrez et la fist ouvrir pour veoir le lieu ou il avoit esté conceus* et regarda de toutez pars dehors et dedens le corps tout froit ne onques ne pleura, ançois *fu* (14*ra*) *si dur que* il pot jugier de la biauté morte. Et toutevois gouvernoit il par sceptre *emperial* touz les peuplez que li souleuz venans voit en oriant et en occident et en midi et en septentrion. Et toutevois ne pot la haute puissance tourner la rage du mauvais empereur Neron? Ha las! ci a greveuse fortune, toutez les foiz que glaivez felons est ajustéz a cruel venim."

[PROSE VII.]

Lors dis je: "Tu meismes sces bien que la couvoitise de l'onneur des mortiex chosez n'ot onques seigneurie sur nous. Mais nous desirasmes matere a ordener les chosez communes pour ce que nostre vertu reposte ne devenist rebouche par viellece." Et lors dist elle: "Certez c'est une seule chose qui puet atraire *a dignité et a puissance* les pensees qui plus sont vaillans par nature, mais elle ne *les y puet pas atraire* menees a la derreniere euvre par perfection de vertuz, c'est a savoir couvoitise de gloire et renommee de tres bonnes meritez faites au commun profit. Mes comme ceste gloire est petite et voide de tout profit, ainsi le pues veoir. Certaine

---

58 retiennent (*BR*): P^1C^2 treuvent (*i.e.* tiennent) C^1b retient.
60 tant seulement: *Rb om.*; fait elle: BRC^1DS fait $P^2P^3A^1A^2M$ font.
60-1 ainçois . . . dignes: A^1A^3 *om.*
60 demonstre: P^2P^3M demonstrent.
61 pour (ce): P^1C^2 en P^2 par C^1 per.
62 vous vous esjoissiés (esjoisséz): P^3DS-P^3A^3 vous esj. P^1C^2 nous nous esjoissons; en: C^1P^3 a *D om.*
64 celles: C^1b ces.
66 dignité dignité (*aS*): *b* d. appelee d. *B* ne puet mie estre apelee puissance de dignite.
69 bonté: *DS* biaute; quant: *b* que.
70 est conjointe (*a*): *b* s'est ajointe (P^3 se adjoint).

METRE VI.

1 (*et*) *com grans* (*aDS*): P^3 *om.* A^1A^3M grans P^3 grans *but* com *marginal;* agraventeurez: BRC^1b (*except* P^3) acraventeures C^2 agraventemens A^3P^4 acraventemens P^3 cruaultez.
2 *Neron*: $C^1A^2A^3P^4$ Noiron (Noyron) *BR* Noirons; ardoir: P^1 ardoit; la: P^2 sa *DS* ja sa; et: *b* il.
2-3 les . . . ocirre: RA^3P^4 *om.*
3 fist ocirre: C^1A^1 *om.*; ocirre: P^3 tuer; *despecier*: C^2R depecier C^1S despichier *D* depichier; *despecier fist*: *the rest* fist de.; *fist*: P^3 *om.*
5 dehors: C^1RDS et de.; ne pleura (*according to* P^4): P^3 nen *the rest* ni (ny).
7 que . . . venans: P^4 veneus A^3 venant.
8 et (en occ.): *b om.*; et (en midi): *Rb om.*; ne pot la: P^1C^2 ne pot (C^2 peut) il pas.
9 tourner: P^1C^2 tourne A^3 couvrir: mauvais empereur Neron: *b* tres m. N. RA^3P^4 mauvais. N.
10 greveuse: P^3 grieve C^1 crueuse; cruel: *S* felon; venim: P^3 tyran.

PROSE VII.

1 meismes: *b om.*
2 ot: P^1D ont (*i.e.* out).
5-6 plus sont: P^1C^2 *inverted* P^3 sont.
7 par: C^1C^2Rb de *B* par la derreniere oeuvre et a la derreniere perfection.
8 renommee: P^1C^2 renommees.
8-9 Mes . . . profit: P^1C^2 *om.*

chose est, si comme tu as apris par les demonstraisons de astronomie, que touz li avironnement de la terre ne tient fors que la raison d'un point au regart de l'espasce du ciel, c'est a dire que, se elle estoit comparee a la grandeur du ciel, on jugeroit du tout que elle ne contient niant de espasce; puis, donques, que de ceste si petite region en cest monde il en y a la quarte partie et encores moins que *par nous et* par les bestes cogneues a nous est habitee, si comme tu a apris de Tholomee qui le nous preuve. Se tu avoies soustrait par pensee a ceste quarte tant de espasse de terre comme les mers et les paluz contiennent (14*rb*) et comme il en y a de gaste region seche et estendue en large, a paine en remaindra une tres estroite place a abiter aus hommes. Vous donques qui estes avironné et enclos en ce petit point de celui point, comment penséz vous de vostre renommee monteplaier *et acraistre* et de faire porter loing vostre nom? Ou combien contient de grandeur et de largeur vostre gloire qui tant est estreciee *et contrainte* en si estroiz et si petiz sentiers? Encore pues tu a ceste chose ajuster ce que pluseurs nacions, diversez et par langues et par meurs et par raison de toute leur vie, habitent en ce meismes pourpris de cest brief habitacle; aus quiex nacions ne la renommee des sanglez hommes ne certez neis des citéz n'ont pooir de venir et pour la grieté des *loingtiengs* chemins et pour la diversité de parler et par faute de acoustumance de marcheandise. A la parfin au temps que vivoit Marcus Tullius, si comme il raconte en un sien livre, la renommee de la communité de Romme n'avoit onques trespassé celle montaigne *qui est apelee* Caucasus, et si estoit lors Romme bien acreue et redoubtee neis aus Turs et a ces autrez gens habitans entour eulz. Ne vois tu donques comment la vostre gloire est estroite et compressee que vous ainsi vous travailliéz de li acraistre et de monteplier? Pourra donques la gloire d'un homme romain aler la ou la renommee du nom de Romme ne puet trespasser? Et encores que diras tu a ce: tu vois que les meurs de diversez gens se descordent entreuz et *leurs loys et* leurs establissemens si que *ce que li un jugent pour vertu, li autre le jugent pour* (14*va*) *vice et* ce que li un jugent digne de loenge, li autre le jugent digne de tourment. Dom il avient que se aucuns se delite en la loenge de sa renommee, pluseurs peuples seront a cui le nom de celui ne pourra venir. Or se tendra donques chascuns apaiéz de la gloire pupliee entre ses voisins et celle pardurableté de noble renommee sera restrainte dedens les bonnes d'une maniere de gens. Mais certez maint homme qui tres noble furent en leur temps sont mis en oubli par faute d'escripvains. Ja soit ce que li escript ne leur vaillent niant, les quiex ancienneté longue

---

10 demonstraisons: BRP^2DS -oisons P^3 demonstrances C^1M demonstrations.

13 contient: $RP^3A^1A^2M$ tient *B* tendroit.

16 nous (preuve): P^1 vous *b om.*

21 penséz: P^1 paisez.

23 de grandeur et de largeur: C^1b *inverted* *B* de largeur; et: P^1C^2 ou.

24 estreciee (P^1C^2R): P^2A^2 -chiee *DS* -chie A^1 -chee P^3 estroissie *M* estroite *B* esdreciee et estroite C^1 estrecie et estrainte.

26 toute leur vie; P^1 toutes leurs vies.

27 sanglez: $P^3A^1A^2M$ singuliers.

28 la grieté (*according to* BRC^1): P^1C^2 le griece (A^1MS griefte P^3 griefvete); *loingtiengs*: C^2 loingtiens A^1A^2M loingtains BRP^2P^3 lointains C^1DS lontains.

29 acoustumance: *B* continuance.

30 parfin: P^1C^2 parfois; marcheandise . . . Tullius: A^2 *om.*; Marcus Tullius: *B* m'rtusculus.

32 trespassé: *Rb* (*except DS*) -see; Caucasus: *B* Carthasus.

34 gloire: *BR* chaere.

35 et . . . acr. et: *B om.*; que: $P^3A^2A^1M$ qui.

36 Pourra: *B* portas; aler: *BR om.*; la ou: C^1b ou.

39-40 *ce que . . . vice et*: C^1 *om.*

39 *li un* (*according to* C^1P^2): P^1C^2R li uns BP^3M les uns.

40 *vice*: *BR* vilte; jugent: P^1 juge.

40-1 *B*: ce que les uns jugent de gre, les autres jugent par torment.

43 pupliee (P^1C^2R): C^1 puplije A^1A^2 peupliee *B* puepliee P^2DS peuploiee *M* publiee P^3 peuplee.

44 noble: P^1C^2 celle.

45 bonnes . . . gens: P^1C^2 hommes.

47 li escript ne leur vaillent (*editor's corr. for* vaille) niant ($P^1C^1C^2$): *B* leurs ecrivains ne leur valent noient *R* li escrit ne leur valent noiant *b* je ne sce pas que cil escript profitent.

47-8 anc. long. et oscure: P^1 ancienetéz longuez et oscurez.

et oscure efface avec leurs aucteurs. Mais il vous est avis que vous aqueréz pardurableté a vous quant vous penséz la renommee du temps a venir. Mais se tu la compairez aus espassez de pardurableté qui sont sens fin, quelle chose as tu de quoy tu te puisses esjoir de la longue durableté de ton nom? Car se la demeure d'un seul moment de temps estoit comparee a diz mile ans, pour ce que l'une et l'autre espasse est fenie, ja soit ce que cil momens ait tres petite partie de temps, toutevois en a il aucune. Mais cil meismes nombrez de ans et chascuns nombres qui par celui puet estre montepliéz ne puet estre comparéz a la durance de pardurabletéz qui ne puet estre terminee. Car des chosez fenies puet on faire comparaison entreus, mais de chose sens fin a chose fenie ne pourra jamais estre faite comparaison. Dom il est ainsi que la renommee de si lonc temps comme il te plaira a penser, se elle est comparee a la pardurableté qui ne puet estre espuisiee *ne comprise,* elle ne te semblera pas estre petite, mais plainement nulle. Mais vous ne savéz (14*vb*) riens faire, *ne bien ne* a droit, fors aus oreilles du peuple et a vanitéz des nouvelles et, delaissiee la grant valeur de conscience et de vertu, requeréz vos loiers de paroles estranges.

Or reçoif *et entent* comment en la legiereté *de l'orgueil* de ceste vaine gloire uns homs moca *et deçut belement et* soutiuement un autre. Car comme uns eust assailli par blasmes *et par ledenges* un autre homme qui, non mie a l'usage de vraie vertu mais pour orgueilleuse gloire, avoit pris seur soi faussement le nom de philosophe et li eust dit que il seroit seurs, savoir mon, se cil fust philosophe, c'est a savoir s'il eust souffert *et porté* debonnairement et en pacience les injures, *ce est a dire les hontes et les tors* que cil li faisoit *et disoit,* il prist un petit en soy pacience et, quant il out receu les outragez *et les hontez que cil li ot faitez ou ditez,* il aussi comme en soi esjoissant dist *a la parfin:* "N'aperceuz tu ore pas bien", dist il, *"et entens* que je sui philosophe?" Lors li respondi cil trop asprement: "Je l'avoie", dist il, "entendu, se tu te feusses teu". Mais quelle chose est ce qui aus noblez hommes apartiengne *et qui leur remaingne* de leur renommee puis que leur corps est tourné en cendre par la derreniere mort, car des noblez hommes *et des miex vaillans* qui par vertu requierent gloire de renommee parlons ici. Car se li homme meurent tuit et du tout, *c'est a dire corps et ame ensemble,* la quelle chose nos raisons nous deffendent que nous ce ne croions, leur gloire est du tout nulle *aprés la mort,* comme cil de qui on dit que celle gloire est, ne soit jamés en nulle maniere. Et se l'ame qui a en soy conscience de bonnes euvrez, (15*ra*) desliee de la chartre du corps, s'en vet franche *et delivre* ou ciel, ne despira elle pas toute

---

48 est avis: *P^3* semble.

50 tu: *P^1C^2 om.*; compairez: *BRC^1P^2DS* comperes *$P^3A^1MC^2$* compares *A^2* comperes; espassez: *P^2* estrace.

52 demeure: *$P^3A^1A^2M$* memoire; de temps: *B* de ciex.

55 de ans: *b* de temps *D om.*; et chasc. nombres: *P^1C^2BD om.*

56 ne (puet): *P^1* qui ne; a: *P^1C^2* en.

57-60 terminee . . . estre: *B om.*

61 *ne comprise*: *B* ne souprise *P^1 om.*; estre petite: *P^1 inverted.*

62 riens faire: *P^2DS inverted; ne bien ne* a: *$P^3A^1A^2M$* n'a point n'a.

63 a: *C^1DS* as; delaissiee (*RB*): *the rest* delaissies (-iez).

64 requeréz: *b* (*except A^2*): et r.

65 reçoif (*C^1P^2DS*): *P^1B* recoit *R* recois *P^3M* recoi *A^2* recoip *A^1* rechief *C^2* recei; comment: *a* (*except C^1*) *P^2 om.* *A^1* comme; *orgueil*: *P^1C^2* oreille.

66 moca *et deçut*: *$P^3A^1A^2M$* aura deceu; soutiuement: *C^1* soutilment *b* souefment (*P^3* souefvement).

67 *ledenges*: *P^1* les deges; un autre homme: *b om.* (*replaced by* un autre *after* assailli); qui: *$P^1C^1C^2R$ om.*

68 avoit pris: *P^2DS* avoir prist.

72-3 faisoit . . . *li*: *D om.*

72 soy: *b om.*; pacience: *B* de p.; il (out): *P^1C^2* cil.

74 dist *a la parfin*: *P^1 inverted*; aperceuz (*corrected for a* perceuz *from P^1C^2*): *the rest* apercois; ore pas (*C^1*): *R* or mie *Bb* pas ore (ores) *P^1C^2* ore.

75 cil: *P^3A^2M* l'autre *A^1* l'un (*for* l'aú?).

76 te feusses teu: *B* ne fusses tiex.

79 *miex vaillans*: *B* humains; qui par vertu: *P^2 om.*

79-82 de renommee . . . gloire: *B om.*

81 deffendent: *C^1* deffent *$P^2P^3A^1A^2M$* enseignent.

82-3 cil de qui: *DS* cilz des quels.

83 soit: *DS* soient.

84 a en soy: *DS* est en; desliee: *B* de leesce.

besoingne terrestre quant elle, usans du ciel, s'esjoist de estre soustrete aus chosez terriennez? *Donques n'a elle cure de la gloire de renommee.*

[METRE VII.]

Quiconques par pensee trebuchable requiert seule gloire et croit que ce soit li souverains biens, regart les contrees du ciel larges et grans et l'estroit siege des terrez, il aura honte de son nom acreu qui ne puet raemplir le petit avironnement de la terre. O las! li orgueilleus pour quoy convoitent il en vain lever leurs colz hors du jou mortel? Ja soit ce que renommee espandue, trespassans par peuples lointiens, aille par toutez *ou par diversez* langues et que grant maison *ou grant mesnie* resplendisse de nobles loenges, la mort despit haute gloire, elle envelope ensemble le haut chief et le bas et aive *et fait igaulz* les tres petitez chosez aus tres haultez. Ou sont ore les os de Fabricius le loyal? Quelle chose est ore Brutus ou Chatons li roidez? Leur petite renommee demourans demonstre leur vain nom par un pou de letres. Mais pour ce que nous avons cogneuz les biaus moz *renomméz de leurs nons*, est il donques donné aus mors a ce savoir? Certez non. Donques gesiéz vous du tout mescognoissable ne vostre renommee ne vous fait pas cogneuz. Et se vous cuidéz plus longuement vivre par le vent de vostre mortel nom, quant li derreniers jours vous ostera ce nom, la seconde mort vous prendra lors.

[PROSE VIII.]

"Mais pour ce que tu ne cuidez que je vueille contre Fortune faire bataille qui ne puisse estre apaisiee, (15*rb*) aucune foiz avient il que il semble que elle, decevable, deserve a avoir des hommes bonne merite *et bonnes gracez*, c'est assavoir lors, comme elle se euvre, quant elle desqueuvre son front et demonstre ses meurs. Par aventure tu n'entens pas mes paroles. C'est merveille que je vueil dire et, pour ce, en puis je a paine desploier la sentence par paroles. Car je croi que fortune contraire, *felonnesse et pouvre*, profite plus aus hommes que fortune amiable, *debonnaire et riche*. Car l'amiable, quant elle apert debonnaire *et digne* par semblance de beneurté, elle ment touz jours; la contraire est touz jours

---

86 usans du: *B* luisant au; s'esjoist: *b* s'esjoira.

87 de (ren.): P^1C^3 *om.*

METRE VII.

3 siege: P^1 siegez *b* siecle; son nom: BA^3P^4 soy.

4-5 pour . . . mortel: A^3 *om.* *B* pour seeurs couvoitent il leur ciex hors de non mortel (!).

5 lever: *b* eslever; lever leurs colz: *b inverted;* hors: *R* fors P^1C^2 *om.*; jou: C^1 jour BP^4 non.

6 toutez: *B* t. contrees.

7 langues: C^1 contrees; *ou grant mesnie*: *B* ou g. manoir C^1 ou grans mainíes $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; resplendisse: P^2DSC^1 -issent; de: $P^3A^1A^2M$ par.

8 la . . . gloire: P^8DS *om.*; haut chief: P^1C^3 *inverted.*

9 aive (*according to R*): $P^1C^2P^3A^2M$ aime (*corrected to* alive *in* P^8) A^1 amis *D* ame *S* ōnie BA^3P^4 avient C^1 mue: et aive: P^3 *om.*; *et fait*: *b* (*except* P^8) parfes; aus tres: P^2 entres (*corrected to* au tres) A^3 aultres A^1 aut's.

10 de: P^1 *om.*; Fabricius: P^1 Fabrius *D* Fabricus *B* Fabrical; Chatons: A^3 chantons.

10-1 li roides? Leur: *B* les roys de.

11 vain: *B* vil.

14 gesiéz (P^1P^2): $C^2A^1A^3MDS$ gisiez (-ies) C^1 gissies $BA^3P^3P^4$ gisez *R* geses.

14-5 ne vostre . . . cogneuz: P^2 *om.*

16 vent: *B* voult; jours: P^1 noms *B* nō; nom: *b om.*

PROSE VIII.

1 vueille (RP^3A^1M): P^1C^2 vueil A^2 veuile *BS* veulle C^1D voelle P^8 voille.

2 apaisiee: *R* apeticiee.

3 deserve (*a*; C^3 reserve): *b* ne desserve (*M* desire) . . nulle; merite: *B* verite.

3-4 *et bonnes gracez*: *b om.*

4 comme: BP^3D que *S* quant; se P^1C^2B *om.*; euvre: *D* oeure *S* coeure.

6-7 C'est . . . paroles: *B om.*

6 C'est: *R* ceste.

7 croi: *B* cuit.

8 *felonnesse et pouvre*: *B* soit f. et pour ce.

9 *debonnaire*: *B* et debonnairete; l'amiable: P^1 l'ami; *digne*: *b* soeuf (*M* soeufve) *BR* seure C^1 dame (C^1: apert de patience dame par sanlant).

10 ment: *B* vient C^1 esrāment; la contraire est: *B* au c. et.

veraie quant elle monstre par sa muance qu'elle n'est pas estable. L'amiable les deçoit; la contraire les enseingne. L'amiable lie de la biauté des biens mençongiers les pensees des hommes qui en usent; la contraire les deslie par la cognoissance de la muable beneurté. Tu pues donques l'amiable veoir menteresse, escoulouriable et mescognoissant de soy meismes, et la contraire atrempe, restraincte et sage par l'usage de ses mescheances. Au derrenier la beneuree les atrait par blandissez et les fait desvoier du souverain bien et la maleuree les y ramaine plus souvent et les retrait a un croc. Cuidez tu ore que tu doies tenir a petite chose ce que ceste fortune aspre et orrible *qui t'a ci mis* t'a descouvert les pensees de tes loyaus amis? Iceste a departi les visages certains et doubteus de tes compaignons. Quant elle se parti de toy, elle te toli les siens amis et te laissa les tiens. Quant tu estoies richez et aesiéz *et beneuréz,* si comme il te estoit avis, (15*va*) combien vousissez tu lors ce avoir acheté, *ce est a savoir que tu les cogneussez lors si bien comme tu les cognois ores.* Or ne te complaing pas donques des richessez perdues *ou ne les quiers plus,* car tu as trouvé la plus precieuse maniere des richeces qui puisse estre trouvee. c'est a savoir vrais amis.

[METRE VIII.]

Ce que li mondes tourne diversement par estable foi ses acordables muances, ce que les contraires qualitéz des elemens tiennent entreus aliance pardurable, ce que li soleus par sa bele presence aporte le cler jour, ce que la lune a seignorie sus les nuiz que li vesprez amaine, et que la mer couvoiteuse *de pourprendre la terre* refrene ses floz par certain terme, et que les terres ne puissent trop estendre leur largez bonnes—ceste ordenance de chosez est liee par Amour gouvernant les terres et la mer et commandant neis au ciel. Se ceste Amour relascoit les frains, toutez les chosez qui s'entreaiment orendroit feroient tantost bataille et estriveroient de depecier la façon du monde, la quelle il demainent ore en acordable foy par biaus mouvemens. Ceste Amour neis constraint touz peuples par aliance sainte, ceste Amor enlace le sacrement de mariage par chastes amours, ceste neis

---

11 veraie: C^1 venant; sa muance: *B* semblance; L'amiable: C^1A^1 la muable.

12 les (deçoit): *B* la *b om.*; les (ens.): *b om.*; L'amiable: P^1C^3 l'ennuiable C^1A^1 la muable; lie: *B* liee.

14 de la muable ($C^1RP^2A^1$): P^1C^2 de sa m. BP^3MDS del amiable.

14-5 de la . . . veoir: A^3 *om.*

14 beneurté: *B om.*

14-5 l'amiable veoir: *B* l'a. avoir *R* la muable avoir *b inverted*.

15 escoulouriable: P^3 decourant; soy (*a*): $P^2DSA^1A^2$ li P^3 lui *M* elle.

16 sage par l'usage: *B* sa plus sages.

17 la beneuree: C^1P^3 la beneurte *R om.*; desvoier: P^1C^3 esjoir.

18 y ramaine: *S* y amaine C^1 ramaine P^1 remaine; retrait ($P^1C^1C^2$): *S* retient *BRb* y retrait.

20 t'a descouvert: *B* de escouter (!).

21 departi: P^1 desparti; visages: *B* usages; doubteus (*a*): *b* les d.

22-3 quant . . . tiens: *B om.*

22 parti: *Rb* (*except DS*) departi.

23 richez et: *b om.*; aesiéz (P^1R): C^3 aisiez C^1 aaisiez *B* aisie *b* (*except MS*) a aise *M* aise *S* accuse.

24 tu: P^1C^3 *om.*

26 complaing: *DS* plaing.

27 des richeces: *B om.*; puisse . . trouvee: P^1 puissent . . trouveez.

METRE VIII.

1 par: P^1C^3 et par.

2 ce: *BD* et; tiennent: *S* troevent; entreus: *b* en eus.

3 sa: P^1C^2 la P^2DS se; C^1: par baille sa presence et porte.

4 lune: *B* nue; amaine: *R* amoinne *B* envoie; et que: *b* ce que.

5 refrene ses floz (*R*): *B* r. les f. P^4 refraine les f. C^3 refraine ces f. A^3 refraigne les f. P^1C^1 referme les f. *b* (*except S*) se refraint *S* restraint.

6 terres: BRA^3P^4 termes; trop (*a except B*): A^3P^4B plus *b om.*; estendre: *B* ataindre.

7 gouvernant: RP^4 gouvernent A^3 gouvernement *B* pour gouverner.

7-8 commandant neis: BRP^2D commandent n. P^4 comment n. A^3 couvient regarder.

8 relascoit (P^1C^2): BRP^3A^2M relascho t P^2A^1 relachoit *D* relaichoit *S* relaissoit C^3 relaschet P^4 relachast A^3 se lachast.

9 feroient ($BC^1P^3A^1A^2M$): $P^1C^2RP^2DS$ feront; estriveroient: $P^1C^3RP^2DS$ estriveront.

10 en: *b* par.

11 Ceste Amour: C^1 diex; neis cont.: P^1 *inverted;* constraint (*according to B*): A^3P^4 contraint *the rest* contient; sainte: *B* faites.

12 ceste Amor: C^1 diex BRA^3P^4 ce est asavoir; enlace: BRP^4 en lacie A^3 en lassie D enlaiche; sacrement: *B* autrement.

donne et dite leurs droiturez aus compaignons loyaus. O, beneuréz fust li lignages humains, se celle Amour par quoy li cielz est gouvernéz gouvernast vos couragez." (15*vb*)

[BOOK III]

[PROSE I.]

Elle avoit ja feni son chant quant la douceur de sa chançon m'avoit ja trespercié, qui glouz estoie de oir et avoie les oreillez dreciees *pour entendre les autres chosez qui remanoient a dire.* Adonques li dis je un petit aprés: "O", dis je, "tu qui es li souverains confors des angoisseuz couragez, combien m'as tu refait *et raempli* et par le pois de tes sentences et par le delit de ton chant! Si que je *ne cuide pas ore estre si foibles ne si pooreus que je ne puisse bien et ose recevoir et souffrir touz les assaus et touz les coups que Fortune me puet faire et me cuide bien deffendre d'elle ne* ne me cuit pas despareil a ses coups. Si que les remedez, que tu me disoies qui estoient un pou plus aigres, je ne les redoubte pas tant seulement nient, ainçois suis si couvoiteus de oir les que je te requier ardammant que tu les me dies."

Lors dist elle: "Ce senti je bien", dist elle, "quant tu, taisans et ententis, ravissaies mes paroles et atendi ou que tu auroies tel habit de pensee comme tu as ores ou que je meismes le te parfis qui est encores plus vraie chose *que atendre.* Certez les chosez qui remaingnent *a dire* sont telles que, quant on en gouste premierement, elles mordent, mais quant elles sont receues dedens, elles adoucissent. Mais pour ce que tu dis que tu es couvoiteus de oir, de com grant ardeur esboudroiez tu, se tu savoies ou je te vueil mener!" "Ou me veulz tu", dis je, "mener?" "A celle vraie beneurté", dist elle, "que (16*ra*) tu songes en ton courage, mais pour ce que ta veue est empechiee pour l'ymaginacion des chosez terriennes, tu ne pues celle beneurté regarder." Lors dis je: "Fai, je t'en pri, et me demonstre sans demeure quiex est celle vraie beneurté." "Si ferai je", dist elle, "volentiers pour la cause de toy. Mais je te senefierai avant par paroles et m'efforceray a toy enformer *et toy faire entendre* celle fausse cause de beneurté que tu cognois miex, si que, quant tu auras regardé celle et auras flechi tes yeulz en la contraire partie, tu puisses cognoistre la clarté de vraie beneurté.

---

13 dite: P^3 dicte D diche B di ce.
14 celle: *b* ceste; par: P^1C^2 pour.
15 vos: P^1 nos.

BOOK III.
PROSE I.

1 quant: *b* car; sa chançon: *b* son chant P^1 sa chacon.
3 li: P^1 le.
5 refait *et*: *b* *om.*; et (par): P^1C^2 *om.*; le (pois): P^1C^2 les; sentences (*a*): b paroles.
6 *estre*: P^1C^2 *om.*; *pooreus*: C^2 poureus *b* paoureus C^1 paourous B peresceux; *ne si pooreus*: R *om.*
7 *puisse*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ recoive; *et ose . . . souffrir*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; *et souffrir*: DS *om.*; les (assaus): P^3DS ces; *coups*: DS caus P^3 cos.
8 *cuide* (P^1C^2): *the rest* puis; *d'elle* (P^1C^2): BRC^1P^3DS de li $P^3A^1A^2M$ de lui; cuit: $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy.
9 despareil (BRC^1A^2DS): A^1 desperel P^2 desparail P^3 non pareil C^2 appeil'r P^1B despareillier.

11 si: P^1C^2 *om.*; ardammant: P^1 rdammant; ardammant que tu: *b* que tu errament.
12 senti: B savoie; taisans: B seurs.
13 atendi (BDS): *the rest* entendi; tu: P^1C^2 *om.*
15 *que*: *b* a (A^2 *om.*); *atendre* (B): *the rest* entendre; *after* atendre *the editor has suppressed the words* quelle merveille; *a dire*: *b* *om.*
16 en gouste (C^1DS): P^1C^2 a g. R en coute P^2 en goutēt $P^3A^1A^2M$ les gouste B les encontre.
19 Ou . . . mener: $P^1C^2P^2DS$ *om.*
22 Lors dis je: BP^2DS *om.*
23 quiex (P^1P^2B): C^1 qui C^2Rb (*except* P^2) quele.
24 la cause: S l'amour; par paroles: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
25 enformer *et toy*: R enforcier et toi B efforcier et te *b* *om.*; *entendre*: P^3 cougnoistre.
28 beneurté (*a*): *b* lumiere.

[METRE I.]

Qui veult semer un champ plantereuz, il le delivre avant des espines et trenche a la faus *les esglentiers et les chardons et* les buissons et la fuchiere pour ce que li blez y viengne pesans de espiz *et de grain.* Miel *et chascune autre viande* est plus douce quant on a gousté avant des saveurs males *et ameres.* Les estoilles resplendissent plus agreablement quant li fors vens de midi laisse ses soufflaiz pleuieus. Puis que l'estoille du matin a chaciee la nuit tenebreuse, li jours en apert aprés plus biaus et plus clers. Aussi tu, regardans premierement les faulz biens, commence a retraire toy de leur amour greveuse et pesant; et li vrai bien entreront aprés en ton courage."

[PROSE II.]

Lors arresta elle un petit la veue *de ses yeulz* et se retraist aussi comme en l'estroit siege de sa pensee et commença ainsi a parler: "Toutez les cures *et toutez les pensees* des mortiex hommes qui se travaillent en diversez estudez vont certez par divers sentiers, mais il s'esforcent tuit de venir a une fin tant seule- (16*rb*) ment de beneurté. Et ce est uns telz biens que, quiconques l'a aquis, il ne puisse plus nulle chose desirier oultre. Et ceste chose est li souverains biens de tous biens contenant dedens soy touz biens; et se aucune chose li failloit, il ne pourroit pas estre souverains, car aucun bien remaindroit dehors qui pourroit estre desiriéz. Or est ce donques chose clere que beneurtéz est estaz parfaiz par amoncelement de touz biens. Ceste beneurté, si comme nous avons dit, s'esforcent de aconsuivre tuit li mortel par divers sentiers. Car la couvoitise du vray bien est entee naturelment es pensees des hommes, mes erreur desvoiable les en retrait et les maine aus faulz biens. Dom aucuns croient que souverain bien soit vivre *sens pouvreté et* sans besoing et travaillent a ce que il soient habondans de richeces. Li autre croient que estre tres digne de honneur soit souverains biens; cist s'esforcent a estre redoubté de leurs voisins par honneurs aquisez. Li autre croient que tres haute puissance soit souverains biens; cist desirent ou regner ou estre privéz *et familiers* aus roys. Il est avis aus autres que noblece de renommee est li souverains biens; cist se hastent de aquerre glorieus nom par les ars de bataille ou de paix. Li pluseurs cuident que joie et leesche soit li souverains biens; cil cuident que tres beneuree chose soit que habonder de deliz corporex. Li autres

METRE I.

1 avant: P^1C^2 *om.*

2 *esglentiers*: P^2 aiglentiers *R* aglentier P^4C^1 englentiers; buissons: P^1 byssons C^2 bussons; fuchiere: P^4 fougiere *R* feugiere *DS* lechiere.

3 pour ce que: P^3 afin que; Miel: A^3 *om.*

4 *autre viande* (aA^3): $P^3A^1A^2M$ chose douce P^2 *marginal* chose *DS* liqueur; est: P^1C^2 *om.*; a gousté (BC^2P^3): P^1A^3 la g. C^1S en g. *R* si g. $P^2A^1A^2MD$ gouste.

5 plus: *b* miex et plus.

6 soufflaiz: *the rest* soufflez (-es); pleuieus (P^1C^2; *corrected from* pleureus): RA^2 pluieus *M* pluyeux A^1A^3 pluieux P^4 plueux C^1P^3 pluvieus BP^2 plungeus *DS* plougans.

7 jours . . . biaus . . . clers (*according to* BC^1C^2): P^1 jour . . . biau . . . cler; biaus: C^2 bleauz.

8 premierement: BRP^4 *om.*

PROSE II.

1 retraist: *DS* traist; aussi: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

2 sa pensee: P^3 son couraige; cures (*BR*): *the rest* (*except* P^3) euvres P^3 ames.

3-4 en diversez estudez: P^1C^2 en diversez manieres et en div. est. C^1b en divers est.

4 certez: *DS* cerchant.

6 puisse: C^1 puist *B* pense; oultre (P^1C^2R): BC^1b autre.

7 de tous biens: P^1C^2 *om.*

7-8 de tous b. . . . biens: *B* *om.*

8 pourroit pas estre: *b* seroit pas (P^2 se voit pas).

9 est (ce): P^1M *om.*

10 chose clere: *b* *inverted*; beneurtéz: P^1 beneurez; par: P^1C^2 et par.

11-2 de aconsuivre: *B* a cognoistre.

12 tuit: P^1C^2 *om.*

13 entee: *B* entree; mes: P^1C^2 *om.*; desvoiable: *B* deuourable *R* desvoia les.

13-4 les en retrait: P^1 les r. *R* en r. P^3 entretrait *S* lez en enretiët.

14 maine (P^1C^2): C^1S amaine *R* amoinne *B* envoie *b* (*except S*) ramaine.

17 a: P^1C^2 de P^3 *om.*

17-9 cist . . . biens: C^1 *om.*

19 desirent ou regner ou: *B* desirer ouurer (!).

22 que . . . cuident: P^1 *om.*

23 que (hab.): P^3 de RP^2MAS *om.*; de: *B* es P^3 en.

sont qui les fins et les causez de ces devant diz biens entrechangent *et transmuent,* si comme cil qui desirent richeces pour avoir puissance et deliz ou qui desirent puissance pour avoir deniers ou pour cause de renommee. En ces chosez donques et en ces autres (16*va*) telles est tournee l'entencion des fais et des desiriers humains, si comme sont noblece et grace de peuple qui donnent aus hommes, ce leur est avis, une maniere de renommee; et si comme sont fame et enfans qui sont requis par cause de delit *et joieuseté;* et si comme est celle tres sainte maniere de amis qui n'est pas ou nombre *des biens* de fortune, mais de vertu, *c'est a dire qui ne vient pas de fortune, mais de vertu, et cist sont li vrai ami.* Mais li autre maniere de amis est requise *et receue* pour cause de puissance ou de delit.

Or sommes prest de raporter les biens du corps aus chosez dessus dites. Car il semble que force de corps et grandeur doingnent puissance, et que biauté et isneleté doingnent *noblece et* renommee et que santé doingne delit. En toutez ces chosez apert il que seule beneurté est desiree, car ce que chascuns desire seur toutez autres chosez il juge que ce soit li souverains biens. Mais nous avons defeni que li souverains biens est beneurtéz; pour quoy chascuns juge que li estaz que il desire seur touz autres soit beneurtéz.

Donques as tu devant tes yeulz proposee pres que *toute* la forme de la beneurté humaine, c'est a savoir richeces, honneurs, puissances, gloirez, deliz. Et ces seules chosez regarde seulement li Epicurians et puis juge tantost et establist que deliz est li souverains biens pour ce que toutez ces chosez, si comme il li est avis, aportent joieuseté au courage des hommes. Mais je retourne aus estudez des hommes, des quiex li courage requiert toutevois le souverain bien, ja soit ce que il le requiere par occurcie remembrance, mais *il ne scet* par quel sentier *il y retourt,* si comme (16*vb*) hom yvrez qui ne scet retourner a son ostel. Semble il donques que cil foloient qui s'esforcent a ce que il ne aient besoing *ne souffraite* de nulle chose? Certez nulle autre chose ne est qui si bien puisse parfaire beneurté comme estaz planteureus de touz biens et qui n'a mestier *ne besoing* de autrui, ainçois est par soi souffisans a soi meismes. Et folaient donques cil qui cuident que ce qui est tres bon soit tres digne de reverance et de honneur? Certez non car n'est pas chose vilz ne que on doie despire ce que pres que l'entencion de touz les mortiex hommes travaille a aquerre. Et puissance ne doit elle pas estre mise ou nombre des biens? Que sera elle donques? Ja ne doit on pas cuidier que ce qui est miex vaillant de toutez chosez soit foible et sens forces. Et clarté de renommee la doit on despire? Certez ainçois ne puet nulz nier que tout ce qui est tres noble ne semble

---

24 ces devant diz biens (BRC^1b): P^1 ceulz diz devant C^2 ceulz davant diz biens.

25 avoir: P^1C^2 *om.*

27 ces (autres): Bb *om.*; tournee (*a*): b trouvee.

28 et (des): P^2DS *om.*; et (grace): P^1C^2 *om.*

30 fame (*according to* C^1, *etc.*): $P^1BRC^2P^2A^1$ fames.

31-3 n'est . . . amis: B *om.*

32 *biens*: *editor's correction from Chaucer; all manuscripts read:* amis.

32-3 *c'est . . . vertu*: BC^1C^2b *om.*

34 requise *et receue*: b *inverted.*

36-7 puissance . . . doingnent: P^2 *om.*

37 doingnent: D doinsent S donnechent P^3 donnent; que (santé): b om.; doingne: C^1 doinst B doist D doinse S donneche P^3 donne.

39 seur: C^2R sus b dessus B pō.

40 biens: P^1 *om.*

41-2 pour . . . beneurtéz: P^3 *om.*

43 forme: P^2DS fortune.

45 Epicurians (P^2): P^1R espicurians C^1 epiturians DS epicurijens $P^3A^1A^2M$ epicurien B esperitueux C^2 esperitueles.

46 tantost: P^1 t. si comme; li BRC^1b (*except* P^3) *om.*

47 li: C^1Rb *om.*; joieuseté: R joennesce; courage des hommes: C^1 *adds* seulement, mais delis l'aporte au corps avoec.

49 toutevois: B touz jours; le requiere: P^1M requiere R le requiert C^1 le quiere.

50 *y retourt*: C^1R retourt B y recoure P^3M y retourne A^1 retorne.

51 hom: P^1C^2 *om.*

52 nulle: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aucune.

53 beneurté: B seurte.

56 tres (digne): P^2DS *om.*

57 chose: b *om.*

58 pres que: B pres de; les mortiex hommes b hommes m.

61 forces (P^1C^2R): BC^1b force; Et clarté de re (*sic.*): B *om.*

estre tres cler et tres renommé. Et de beneurté que m'apartient il a dire que elle ne soit pas angoisseuse ne triste ne soumise aus douleurs ne aus tristeces, quant neis es tres petites chosez requiert l'en ce qui delite quant on en puet avoir et user? Certes ce sont les chosez que li homme veulent aconsuivre *et aquerre* et pour ceste cause desirent il a avoir richeces, dignitéz, royaumes, gloirez, deliz pour ce que il croient que par ces chosez leur viengne suffisance, honneur, puissance, renommee, leesce. Donques est ce bien que les hommes requierent par tant de diversez estudez; en ce puet on legierement monstrer combien est grant la force de nature, comme ja soit ce que il aient sentences diversez et descordans, toutevois s'acordent (17*ra*) il tuit en amer la fin de bien.

[METRE II.]

Or me plaist a dire par chant soutil et par sons delitables comme nature, puissant et pourveable, *tourne et* flechist les gouvernemens des chosez, et par quiex lais *et par quiex establissemens* elle garde ce grant monde, et comment ele lie et restraint toutez chosez par lien que nulz ne puet deslier.

Ja soit ce que li lyon de Aufrique portent *en leur colz* les beles chaenes, et praingnent les viandez que li hommes leur donnent a leurs mains, et craiment leur felon maistre dom il seulent souffrir les batemens; s'il ont leurs orribles gueules ensanglentees *des bestes devourees,* il retournent a leurs courages de jadis qui longuement avoient esté repost et fremissent griefment et leur remembre de leur nature; il laschent leurs colz des chaenes desliees et est leur maistre li premiers despeciéz *et mengiéz* par leurs crueusez dans et abeuvre de son sanc leurs couragez erragiéz.

Li oisiaus janglierres, qui *par les bois* chante sus les hautez branchez, quant il est enclos en l'estraite cage: ja soit ce que li homme li doingnent par jeu beuvragez emmieléz et largez viandez par doulz estude, s'il avient toutevois, quant il saut par sa maison estroite, que il voie les agreablez ombres des bois, il defoule a ses piéz les viandez esparpilliees et requiert courrouciéz tant seulement et regrete les bois par sa douce voiz.

La verge d'un arbre, courvee par grant force, flechist le sommet de li

---

64 triste: *B* traitre; douleurs (*bB*; C^1 doleur): P^1C^2 doleureus *R* doulereuses; P^3A^1-A^2M a douleurs et a tristesses *B* a doleurs ja tristesce C^1 a doleur et a tristrece *R* a doulereuses tristeces.

65 requiert l'en: P^1C^2 requiert je.

67 aconsuivre: $P^3A^1A^2M$ avoir; avoir (*a*): *b* aquerre.

70 bien (*b*): *a* bon; tant de: *B* tantes P^1A^2 tant; diversez (P^1BR): C^1C^2b divers.

71-2 soit ce: *D* soice.

73 tuit: *DS* tout.

METRE II.

1 par chant: A^3P^4 pour chancon.

2 et (pourv.): P^1 est.

3-4 garde . . . ele: P^1C^2 *om.*

4 lien: $RA^3P^4P^3M$ liens C^2S lieu *D* liu A^2 liex A^1 lieux.

5 li lyon: *B* les hommes; *colz*: C^2B coulz RP^3A^2 cops P^2 cos A^3 coups; les (beles): *Rb* leurs (*A* lēs).

6 praingnent ($P^1C^2P^2A^1A^2$): *RS* prengnent *D* prengent C^1 prendent P^4M prennent P^3 preingnent.

7 craiment (P^1RP^2): *B* trainent A^1A^2M crement C^1D criement *S* criesment P^3 craignent C^2 craingnent A^3P^4 doubtent; felon maistre: *b inverted* C^1 maistre BRA^3 felons mestres; seulent: C^1 leur esteut; batemens (P^1C^2): BRC^1b bateures (-tures) A^3 bastures P^4 bateurs; s'il: *R* cil *B* ceulz P^3 et si.

10 griefment ($C^2RP^3A^1MDP^4$): A^2 griefement BP^2 griement P^1C^2 griesment: laschent (*b except DS*; RA^3P^4): *B* lacent *DS* laissent C^1 deslachent P^1C^2 sachent; des: *Bb* leur.

11 desliees: P^1 desliee; li . . . *mengiéz*: *B* en merites.

12 abeuvre (*editor's correction from R*: abeure, C^1: aboivre, P^4: abuvre): P^1 abeuvrez C^2 abouvrez *B* a boire *b* (*except* A^2) aboivrent A^2 boivrent; leurs couragez erragiéz (P^1C^2): *b* leur courage enragie *R* leur courans courages *B* leur crueux courages C^1 les courans erragies A^3 leur decourt es entrailles P^4 leur gourt aux entrailles.

13 janglierres: P^2 genglierres P^4 jenglierres *S* jenglerres *D* jaingleres *R* jangoillierres *B* courages genglierres (*sic*) C^1 jengloijeres C^2 jaugleurs $P^3A^1A^2M$ jangleur A^3 *om.*; *par les bois* chante ($P^1C^1C^2$): BRA^3P^4b ch. par les b.

14 estraite (*editor's correction for* estrainte): *the rest* estroite.

15 doulz: A^3P^4 grans.

16 saut: P^3 saille; sa: *DS* la $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

17 les ($P^1C^1C^2$): *Bb* ses *R* sa (viande).

18 et regrete: *b om.*; les bois: C^1BRP^4 *repeated before and after* et regrete.

19 courvee (*R*): $P^1C^2BP^2S$ tournee $P^3A^1A^2M$ cornuee *D* c'uee C^1 courue A^3P^4 tiree; sommet: C^1 sousmet.

enclin vers terre; mais se la main qui la courva la relaisse aler, elle regarde le ciel par teste dreciee.

Li soleus chiet au vespre *et semble qu'il se couche* es ondes de la mer, mais il tourne de rechief son char par secré sentier a (17*rb*) l'oriant dom il seult au matin naistre.

Toutez chosez requierent leur propre recors et s'esjoissent chascunes chosez de retourner a leur nature, ne nulle ordenance n'est bailliee aus chosez fors que ce qui joint leur commencement a leur fin et qui fait le tour de elles meismes estable *si que il ne se mue de sa propre nature.*

[PROSE III.]

Certez aussi vous hommes, qui estez bestez terriennes, songiéz toutevois, ja soit ce que par petite ymaginacion, vostre commencement et, par quelque maniere de pensee—ja soit ce que elle ne soit pas bien clere—regardéz toutevois de loing ycelle vraie fin de beneurté et pour ce neis vous maine vostre naturel entencion au vray bien et de celui bien vous retraient maintez erreurs. Or regarde tu meismes se li homme par ces choses par les queles il cuident aconsuivre beneurté, savoir mon, se il peuent venir a celle fin ou il cuident venir par nature. Car se deniers ou honneurs et ces autrez chosez dessus ditez aportent a homme tel bien que nulz des biens ne *li defaille ne ne* li semble defaillir, certez nous recognoistrons lors que aucuns sont faiz beneuréz pour ce qu'il ont ces chosez aquisez. Mais se elles ne peuent ce faire que elles prometent et pluseurs biens leur defaillent encores, n'apert il clerement que fausse semblance de beneurté est en eus cogneue et reprise? Or demande je donques premierement a toi meismes qui de richecez habondaies n'a mie encore passé lonc temps, se tu, entre ces tres habondans richecez, fus onques en ton courage *dolans et* angoisseus d'aucun tort *ou d'aucun grief* qui venist de quelque part?"

"Certez", dis je, "je ne me puis pas remembrer que je fusse onques de si delivre courage que je (17*va*) ne fusse touz jours angoisseus d'aucune chose." "Ne te failloit il pas aucune chose que tu ne vousissez mie que te fausist, ou avoies tu ce que tu ne vousissez pas avoir?" "Ainsi est", dis je.

---

20 enclin (aA^3P^4): *b* avec lui; courva (RC^1): *M* courba (*b correction for* v) $P^1C^2P^2S$ tourna A^1A^2 torna *D* corna *B* corōna P^3 tournee A^3P^4 tira.

21 teste dreciee ($P^1C^2P^3$): A^2C^1 t. drechie A^1M t. drechee *S* t. estrechie *B* ce redrescie *D* ceste destreche P^2 t. destrece (*corrected in margin*).

22 Li soleus: A^3P^4 *om.*; *couche*: *B* touche; ondes: P^1C^2 umbrez A^1M undes.

23 tourne: $BC^1P^2DSMA^3P^4$ retourne; secré: *B* estroit; a l': *b* en.

25-6 requierent . . . chosez: A^3P^4 *om.*

25 leur: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 son; recors: C^1DS retours *BR* cours; s'esjoissent: *B* s'esloignent; chascunes: *BR* toutes.

26 ordenance: *b* ordre (*S* orde).

27 fors que: $bBRC^1$ fors.

27-8 le tour de elles: P^4 les tordelles.

28 estable *si*: *R om.*; *si*: A^3P^4B *om.*; *mue*: *B* mire.

PROSE III.

1 Certez aussi: C^2 c. ainssin *b inverted.*

2 petite: P^1 pitie.

3 quelque (*a except R*): *R* laquele *b* (*except S*) quelconques.

4 vraie: *B* male.

5 vous maine: *B* nōme je; naturel: $C^1BRP^2DSP^3$ naturele; vous (retr.): *B* nous.

6 regarde: P^1B regardez; meismes: *B* mes moz.

6-7 se . . . beneurté: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*; (*BR*: savoir mon *before this passage*).

7 savoir: *BR* et s.

8 celle: P^2DS tele; venir: P^1 renier.

9 et: C^1C^2b ou.

10 *defaille* (*a*): *b* faille; li (semble): *b om.*

11 recognoistrons: P^1 cognoistrons *B* recognoissons; ces: *B* tieulx.

12 se: P^1 ce.

13 pluseurs biens: P^1C^1D pluseur bien; biens: A^2 gens *BR om.*; n'apert: P^1C^2 apert.

14 cogneue (P^1C^2B): C^1R conneue *b* (*except M*) contenue *M* continuee; reprise: P^1 prise.

15-6 mie encore: *DS* pas encore P^2 pas oncores $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

16 passé: P^3 pris; tu: P^1C^2 *om.*; tres: P^3D-*a* (*except* P^1) *om.* A^2 trois.

17 en ton courage *dolans* (*a except R*): *b* d. en ton c. *R* en ton c.

17 d'aucun . . . *grief*: P^3 de quelque injure.

19 je ne me puis pas: P^1C^2 je ne m'en p. p. A^1A^2 je ne me puis P^3 il ne me peut.

21-2 que te . . . pas: BRP^2 *om.*

22 fausist: $C^1P^3A^1A^2M$ faillist; vousissez: *DS* voloyes.

“Donques desiroies tu la presence de l’une et la defaillance de l’autre?” “Je le recognois”, dis je. “Certez”, dist elle, “chascuns a souffraite de ce qu’il desire.” “Souffraite en a il”, dis je. “Certez cil qui a souffraite de aucune chose, il n’est pas du tout suffisant a soi meismez.” “Certez”, dis je, “non.” “Ceste faute donques de suffisance *et ceste souffraite* soutenoiez tu quant tu estoies plains de richeces?” “Pour quoy non? *Je les soutenoie voirement.*” “Donques ne peuent pas richeces faire que homme ne soit souffreteus ne que il soit suffisans a soi meismes; et ce estoit ce que elles prometoient, si comme il est avis aus hommes. Et certez encorez cuit je que ce fait mout a regarder que pecune n’a riens de sa propre nature par quoi elle ne puisse estre tolue a ceulz qui la tiennent malgré euls.” “Je le recognois”, dis je. “Pour quoi ne le recognoistroiez tu, comme li plus fors la toille chascun jour *au plus foible* malgré lui? Car dont viennent donquez les complaintez des plaiz fors que de ce que les pecunes sont requisez qui ont esté tolues a ceulz qui les avoient, par force ou par barat malgré eulz?” “Ainsi est”, dis je. “Donques aura mestier”, dist elle, “chascuns de l’aide requise par dehors pour quoy il deffende sa pecune?” “Qui nieroit ce?” dis je. “Certes il n’en eust pas mestier s’il n’eust la pecune que il peust perdre?” “De ce ne puet”, dis je, “nulz doubter”.

“Or est donques la cho- (17*vb*) se tournee en contraire: que les richeces, que li homme cuidoient que elles les feissent suffisans, les font plus avoir besoing de estrange aide. Mais quelle est la maniere *de peccune* par quoy souffraite puisse estre ostee par richeces? Ne peuent pas li riche homme avoir fain? Ne peuent il pas avoir soif? Li membres des richez hommes ne sentent il pas le froit de yver? Mais tu diras que li richez ont asséz de quoy il saoulent leur fain et ostent la soif et le froit. Mais certez en ceste maniere puet bien souffraite estre confortee, mais du tout ne puet elle pas estre ostee. Car se ceste souffraite, touz jours baians et requerans aucune chose dehors, est raemplie *ou saoulee* par richeces, donques couvient il qu’elle demeure *et soit permanant*, si que elle puisse estre raemplie. Encores me tais je de ce que trop pou de chosez souffist a nature, mais a avarice nulle chose ne li souffist. Par quoy richeces, se elles ne puent oster souffraite et elles meismes font la leur, *quelles chosez ont elles en eulz* pour quoy vous creéz qu’elles vous doignent suffisance?”

---

23 desiroies: *B* desires.

24 recognois: *DS* cognois; dis je: P^2D d. je bien *B* bien.

24-5 Certez . . . je: *B* *om.* (P^3: *A* aucun, dist elle, besoign ou default de chose qu’il desire? Ouil, dis je. Certes, dist elle, s’aucun a souffraite d’auc. chose . . .).

24-5 de ce . . . Souffraite: A^1A^2M *om.*

27 *ceste souff.*: P^1 ceste de s.

28 de richeces: *B* et riches *DS* *om.*; quoy non: *B* toi veoir.

30 ne . . . soit: P^2 et; soit: P^1C^2B ne s. *R* *om.*

31 comme: P^1C^2 *om.*; cuit: C^2S cuide $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy.

32 regarder: *b* (*except S*) garder; riens: *B* nourri.

33 malgré euls (*BR*): $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.* *b* *after* tolue.

34 recognois: P^2DS regehis.

35 la (*editor’s correction for* les): P^1 *om.*; toille: P^3 oste *M* tol’t; malgré: *B* touz jours m.

38 dist elle: *a* (*except R*) *om.*; *S* *after* chascuns.

39 chascuns: BC^1 *om.*; l’aide: *DS* loy.

39-40 sa . . . n’eust: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

40 Qui . . . je: *B* *om.*

42 Or est: *B* qui est P^1C^2 or; que: *Rb* car C^1B quar; en contraire: C^1C^2b au c. *BR* encontre.

43 cuidoient: *B* cuident; suffisans: *B* souffisance; les: BRC^1 leur *b* et eles (A^2 elle) les.

44 quelle est: *B* que elle ait.

46 avoir (fain): *Rb* (*except* P^2): non a. *repeated twice*.

48 la: *B* leur.

50 se c. s.: *B* se c. s. fust.

51 est: *B* et; *ou*: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ et; donques: *B* d. comment.

52 demeure: C^2BRP^2 demeurt.

53-4 a nature . . . souffist: *B* *om.*; nulle chose: $P^3A^1A^2M$ riens.

54 souffraite: *B* souffroiteuses.

55 *ont*: P^1 on; *eulz*: P^3 elles *B* eues C^1 yauls.

56 creéz: P^1 creais C^2P^3 croiez *R* craiez C^1 (nous) creons; (elles) vous (C^2BRS): P^1C^1 nous *b* (*except S*) *om.*; doignent: *D* dignement *B* devisent.

[METRE III.]

Ja soit ce que li riches avers a tout un gort decorant d'or amoncelle richeces qui ja ne li acompliront sa couvoitise, et ait chargié son col de pierres precieusez et face ses champs planteureus arer a cent beus, ja la cure mordans *et angoisseuse* ne le laissera tant comme il soit vis, ne les fuitivez richecez ne li feront pas compaingnie quant il sera mort.

[PROSE IV.]

Mais dignitéz font elles honnorable et redoutable celui a qui elles viennent? N'ont pas les seignories si grans forces que elles metent vertuz es pensees de ceulz qui des seignories usent et leur ostent leurs vicez? (18*ra*) Certez elles ne seulent pas la felonnie chacier, ainçois la seulent plus demonstrer. Dont il avient que nous avons desdaing de ce que les dignitéz sont souvent donnees aus tres felons hommes; dont Catullus apella apostume, *c'est a dire boce, un des conseillers qui avoit nom* Novius, ja soit ce que il fust assis ou siege de sa dignité. Vois tu donques com grant honte font les dignités aus mauvais hommes? Certes leur vilté *et leur vilennie* apparust moins s'il ne fussent renommé d'avoir nullez honneurs. Aussi tu meismes ne peus tu pas a la parfin estre amenéz a ce par tant de perilz quant tu cuidoies gouverner la digneté avec Decorat, comme tu veissez en lui courage de tres felon lecheur et *tres desloyal* accuseur. Certes nous ne poons pas pour les honneurs jugier dignes de reverance ceulz que nous jugons *et tenons* pour non dignes des honneurs meismes. Mais se tu veoies aucun ennobli de sapience, ne porroiez tu pas cuidier que il fust non dignes de reverance et meismement de la sapience dont il est ennoblis?"

"Certez je ne porroie pas *cuidier que il ne fust dignes.*" "Certez dignitéz apartient proprement a vertu, et vertu la transporte tantost en ceulz ou elle est conjointe. Et pour ce que les honneurs du peuple ne les peuent pas faire dignes, il apert bien que il ne ont nulle propre biauté de dignité. En quoy ce doit on plus regarder. Car se li mauvais est de tant *plus vilz et* plus degitéz comme il est plus enz en despit de pluseurs, comme la dignité ne puisse les (18*rb*) mauvais faire dignes de reverance les quiex elle monstre a pluseurs, de tant les fait elle plus despiz, mais nommie sens paine, *c'est a dire que bien se revanchent li malvais.* Car il en rendent aus

---

METRE III.

1 avers: A^3 usiriers; amoncelle: $P^1P^2C^2$ et am.

3 planteureus: A^3P^4 *om.*; cent: *BR* ses.

4 le laissera tant: P^4 les tolt.

PROSE IV.

1 honnorable et redoutable: P^1 -blez et -blez A^1 -bles ne -bles C^1 -bles et -bles (chiaus); et: *b* ne; elles: P^1 il.

2 viennent: *B* veulent; N'ont: *BDS* non.

3 es: *B* et.

4 ne: P^1C^2R nen; felonnie: B folie.

5 que: $P^1P^2C^2$ *om.*; nous avons: $P^1P^2C^2$ a nous; desdaing: P^2 aucuns d. C^1 en d. C^2 par d.

6 souvent: P^2DS *om.*; aus tres: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ entre les *DS* entre C^2 aus; Catullus: *B* caculus.

7 apostume . . . *boce* (*completed and arranged according to Chaucer*): P^1C^2 Boece c'est a dire . . . (*lacuna*), *the rest* (*except* P^2A^1M) boece (-ces) A^1M boce P boece (*e deleted*).

10 apparust: *DS* apperent P^2 appareut; d'avoir nullez honneurs: *DS* de nulle honneur av.; nullez: P^3 aucuns A^1A^2M aucunes.

11 Aussi: P^1C^2R ainsi (ainssint); peus ($C^2P^3A^1M$): P^1P^2 pouoies (*in* P^2 *corrected to* pues) *B* pues *DS* poes C^1 pois *R* pouis A^2 pais.

12 cuidoies: *B* cuides; Decorat: *B* decourant.

16 ennobli (C^1; *b except* P^3A^2): $P^1C^2BP^3A^2$ en oubli *R* enoubli.

17 reverance: *B* sapience; ennoblis (C^1P^2-*DS*; A^1M ennobli): $P^1P^3A^2$ en oubli C^2 en oubliz *R* en troublies *B* entreoubliez.

18 *que . . . dignes*: P^3 *om.*; *ne* (*fust*): $C^1P^2A^1$ nen.

19 et vertu: P^1 et ver.

20 conjointe: *b* jugiee; peuent: *D* puet *S* poet.

21-2 En quoy: *R* a q. *B* aincois.

22 ce (P^1C^1): *the rest* se.

23 enz (*editor's correction*): C^1b (*except* P^2) *om.* P^1C^2 euz RP^2 eus *B* eu.

25 les fait elle (C^1R; *b except* P^3): P^1 elle les *B* fait elle P^3 les fait C^2: elle les plus despit.

26 *se*: $C^1BRP^2A^1M$ sen; *revanchent* (P^1C^2-RP^2M): $BC^1P^3A^1A^2$ revengent *S* revengnent *D* renoncent.

dignitéz aussi grant guerredon quant il les ordoient *et conchient de leurs vilenniez et* de leurs malvaistiéz. Et pour ce que tu cognoissez que celle vraie reverance ne puet venir par ces ombragez dignitéz, se aucuns usans de pluseurs dignitéz estoit venus par aventure en estrangez nacions, le fera celle honneur estre honorable *et redoutable* aus estrangez? Mais se honneur *et reverance* fust naturex dons aus dignitéz, elles ne cessassent jamés entre nulle genz *en nul lieu* en nulle maniere de faire leur office, si comme li feus en quelque terre qu'il soit toutevois ne laisse il pas a eschaufer. Mais pour ce que ce ne leur vient pas de leur propre nature, mais seulement de la fausse cuidance des hommes *qui cuident que les dignitéz les facent dignes,* tantost s'esvanoissent ces honneurs quant il viennent a ceulz qui ne cognoissent pas ces dignitéz. Mais tu pourras dire que ce est voirs entre estrangez nacions. Mais entre ceulz entour qui elles sont nees, n'y durent elles pas touz jours? Certez la dignité de prefecture fu jadis grant poesté; or est seulement nons vains; et li cens du senatoire estoit jadis grief charge; et *li questeurs,* qui se prenoit garde de l'annee du peuple, *comme des blez et de telz autres chosez,* fu jadis tenus pour grant. Quiex chose est ore plus vil de celle prefecture? Car, si comme nous (18*va*) deismes un petit devant, chose qui n'a riens de propre biauté reçoit aucune foiz sa resplendisseur *et son pris,* aucune foiz la pert par l'opinion des usans. Se les dignitéz donques ne peuent faire les hommes dignes de reverance *ne de honneur,* se elles deviennent ordez *et vilz* par les ordures des malvais, se elles perdent leur resplendisseur *et leur renom* par muance de temps, se elles sont *vaines et* vilz par cuidance des gens, quelle chose ont elles en eulz par quoy on y doie querir biauté, ne moult moins donques aus autres ne la donroient?

[METRE IV.]

Ja soit ce que Neron li orgueilleus o toute sa luxure forsenee se *pignast et* aournast de beles pourpres et de precieusez pierres, toutevois estoit il viguereus *au mal faire et* haineus a touz. Mais toutevois il qui tant estoit mauvais donnoit jadis aus redoutablez peres les honorablez siegez des conseilleurs. Qui cuidera donques que les honneurs que li chetis donnent soient beneureez?

---

27 *conchient:* P^3 honnissent.
29 puet: P^1 peuent; ces: P^1C^2 ses.
30 en ($P^1C^1C^2$): BR as b entre.
31 estre: P^1C^2 *om.*
32 fust: B fussent; cessassent (a): b laissassent.
35 propre nature: b *inverted.*
36 fausse: P^1C^2 fole.
37 ces (C^1b): P^1C^2 ses BR les; a ceulz qui: P^1C^2 quil.
38 cognoissent . . . dignitéz: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ne les cog. pas estre d.
38-9 Mais . . . nacions: R *om.*
38 tu pourras dire: DS pourras tu d. P^3 tu diras.
39 entour (a): b entre; n'y: DS ne.
40 poesté ($C^1RP^2P^3DS$): A^2 poest A^1 pooste M poste P^1C^2B poete.
41 est: P^1C^2 *om.*; seulement: DS maintenant; cens: BR sens.
42 et . . . qui: P^3 se aucun du peuple; prenoit: BR prenoient; de . . . *comme:* P^3 *om.*; *l'annee* (BRC^1S): P^2D lance A^1A^2M l'annone P^1C^2 la nuece.
43 *autres chosez:* b (*except* P^3) *inverted* P^3 aut. ch. du dit peuple il; pour: P^1C^2 par; grant: a grans; Quiex chose (P^1P^2): C^2Rb (*except* P^2) quelle ch. B quel ch. C^1 uiels coses; ore: b o. tenue.
44 vil: C^1 viels.
45 riens de (BRC^1): P^1C^2 riens b point de; resplendisseur: R resplendor.
46 *et:* P^1 de; *son pris:* B souspre̅t; usans: R usances B usages.
47 *ne:* b (*except* P^2) et.
49 *renom* (BRC^1): P^1C^2 honneur b (S *om.*) nom; temps: P^1C^2 ceulz.
49-50 se . . . gens: B *om.*
50 *vaines et:* b *om.*; cuidance: b l'estimacion; ont elles (a): b a il; en eulz: DS en elles; par (P^1C^2R): *the rest* pour, *or abbrev.*
51-2 moult . . . donroient (P^1C^2): C^1R moult m. d. le (R les) donroient as aut. B noient m. d. donroient il aus aut. b pour quoi elles la (DS le; P^3M les) doignent aus aut.

METRE IV.

1 Neron: BRC^1A^1 Noiron A^3P^4 Noyron.
2 precieusez pierres: $P^3A^1A^2MS$ *inverted;* estoit: P^1C^2M est (i.e. ert).
3 viguereus: BR iugierres A^3 jugeres P^4 vigieres; haineus: A^3P^4 mal; a touz: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
5-6 que . . . beneureez: P^2 *om.* DS soient boneurees que li tres mauvais et tres chetis donnent.

[PROSE V.]

Mais les royaumes et les servisez des roys peuent il faire homme puissant?" "Pour quoy ne feroient quant leur beneurté dure pardurablement?"

"Certez li anciens aages est plains de examplez et aussi en est plains li aages presens des roys qui muerent leur beneurté en chetiveté. O, moult est ore puissance de grant noblece qui n'est pas trouvee assés puissans de garder soi meismes. Et se ceste puissance de royaumes est feserresse de beneurté, se elle defaut en aucune partie, n'apeticera elle pas la beneurté et aportera chetiveté? (18*vb*) Mais encores ja soit ce que li humains royaume s'estende moult loing, encores couvient il pluseurs gens remaindre seur cui chascun roy n'a point *de seignorie ne* de commandement. Et certes en celle partie ou celle puissance qui les fait beneurés defaut, par celle entre sus eulz foiblece qui les fait chetis. En ceste maniere donques couvient il que li roy aient plus grant partie de chetiveté que de beneurté. Uns tyrans roys de Sesile, qui avoit esprouvé les perilz de son estat, fainst *et monstra* les paours du royaume par l'espoantement d'un glaive pendant seur la teste *d'un sien familier qui li avoit demandé pour quoy il avoit paour puis qu'il estoit roy.* Quelle est donques ceste puissance qui ne puet oster les mors des curieusetéz ne les aguillons des paours eschever? Certez si voudroient il bien vivre asseur, mais il ne peuent; aprés il se gloirefient de leur puissance. Tiens tu a puissant celui que tu vois qui veult ce que il ne puet faire? Et tiens tu a puissant celui qui a ses costéz avironnéz de multitude de serjans, qui plus craint ceulz que il espoante que il ne craiment lui et qui est mis en la main *et ou pouoir* de ses serjans pour ce que il en apere puissant? Car des familiers aus roys pour quoy t'en diroie je riens, puis que je te monstre les royaumes meismez plains de si grant foiblece? Certez la puissance des roys acravante leurs familiers souvent en leesce et souvent en courrouz. Neron contraint Seneque, son familier et son maistre, a eslire de quel mort il voudroit mourir. Antonius commanda et fist que chevaliers occeissent de glaivez (19*ra*) Papinian qui puissans estoit entre les seigneurs du palais. Et si voudrent li uns et li autres renoncier a leur puissance; dont Seneque s'esforça de baillier ses richeces a Neron et de aler s'en en oiseuse *et en essil.* Mes comme le fais a leur mescheance les tressist, ne li uns ne li autres ne fist ce que il voult. Quiex est donques ceste puissance que cil qui l'ont la redoubtent *et craiment,* et quant tu la voudras avoir tu ne seras pas asseur, et quant tu la desireras a laissier tu ne la

---

PROSE V.

1 servisez (-ces): C^1DS service.

4 plains: *B* plus p.

5-6 O . . . puissans: P^3 o que moult est grant puissance de present qui n'est pas asses puissant.

12 certes: P^1C^2 *om.*; beneurés: P^1C^2 beneurees.

13 entre: BP^2 autre *R* antre; sus (C^2): P^1 en *the rest* seur (sour, sur).

14 aient: P^1 ait.

15 Uns tyrans roys: P^1C^2 un roy; fainst (C^1RD): *M* feigny P^3 feignit *the rest* faint.

16 paours: *R* pouors *B* pooirs; espoantement (P^2): P^1 espaontement C^1BP^3MDS -poen- *R* -puan- $C^2A^1A^2$ -pouen-; d'un: *b* (*except DS*) du.

19 des curieusetéz: *B* de ceste curiosite.

20 de: *b* (*except* P^2) en.

21 puissant: P^1C^2 puissance; qui veult ce: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

22 faire: $P^3A^1A^2M$ f. ce qu'il veult; puissant: P^1C^2 puissance; avironnéz: P^1 avironne.

23 qui il espoante: P^1C^2 qui espaontent (C^2 -pouen-) C^1 qui l'espoentent.

24 mis (*a*): *b* neis; en la main *et ou pouoir*: $C^1P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted* P^1C^2 en là m. ou.

25 aus roys: P^1 au roy.

26 te: P^3 toy.

27 la: P^1 *om.*; des: P^1 de.

28 contraint: *BR* contrainst *DS* constrainst *M* contraigny P^3 contraignit.

29 Antonius (-tho-): *B* Anthonus *D* Anthoninus C^1 Antoines.

31 seigneurs: P^1C^2 puissans *R* saignours; li uns et li autres (*corrected according to l.* 34): P^1 li un et li autre.

32 puissance: *B* puissāt don.

33 aler s'en (P^1RP^2S): $C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ s'en a. C^1 a. soi *B* a. seulz; en oiseuse *et en essil*: P^1C^2 *inverted* *R* en hoiseuses et en e. *B* as oisiaux et en e.; le fais: *editor's addition according to Chaucer*; mescheance: *B* sapience.

34 Quiex est (P^1P^2; C^1 quels): *BR* certes C^2b quelle e.; ceste: P^1C^2 *om.*

pourras eschever? Mais li ami qui sont acordé nommie par vertu mais par fortune, aident il au besoing? Mais certez celui que beneurté aura fait ton ami, maleurté le te fera anemi. Et quelle pestilance est plus puissant a nuire que familiers anemis?

[METRE V.]

Qui voudra estre puissant, il li couvient donter ses couragez felons ne ne mete pas son col vaincu souz les ordes resnes de luxure. Car ja soit ce que ta seigneurie s'estande si loing que la terre de Inde tremble a tes commandemens, et que Thile la derreniere isle soit serve a toy, toutevois se tu ne pues oster hors de toy tes mauvais desiriers et chacier hors tes chetivez complaintez, ce n'est pas puissance.

[PROSE VI.]

Mais gloire, comment est elle decevable souvent et comment est elle souvent laide! Dont uns poetez tragiciens s'escria et non pas a tort et dist: "Gloire, gloire n'est autre chose aus milliers des mortiex hommes fors que grans souflaiz en oreillez!" Car pluseurs ont eu grant renom par les faussez opinions du peuple, et de tel renom quelle chose puet estre pourpensee plus laide? Car cil qui sont (19*rb*) loé faussement *et a tort,* il couvient que il meismes aient honte de leur loengez. Et se il avenoit neis que il eussent aquisez ces loenges par leurs meritez, quelles chosez ajoustent elles a la conscience de sage homme qui *regarde et* mesure son bien non mie par les paroles du peuple mais par la verité de sa conscience? Et se ce est bele chose de avoir estandu *et acreu* son nom, donquez aussi couvient il que ce soit tenu a laide chose se il n'est estanduz *ou acreuz.* Mais, si comme je dis un pou devant, comme il couviengne que pluseurs gens soient aus quiex la renommee d'un homme ne puet pas venir, il avient que, cil que tu cuidez qu'il soit glorieus *et renomméz,* il couvient que il soit en la prochaine partie des terres sans gloire *et sans renom.* Mais entre ces chosez ne cuide je mie que la grace du peuple soit neis digne de remembrance, ne elle ne vient pas de sage jugement ne n'est onques ferme pardurablement. Mais du nom de gentillece, qui est cil qui bien ne voie comme il est vains *et vilz?* Car se elle est raportee a la clarté *de gloire et* de renommee, elle est estrange *de ceulz qui sont tenuz pour gentilz.* Car il semble que gentillece

---

37-8 Mais . . . besoing (*a*): *b* au besoing ne sont donques cil pour aidier ami que fortune concilie (*S* conseille P^3 consilie) ou conjoint et non mie vertu.
38 au: P^1C^2 *om.*
39 le te fera (*BRC*^{1}): *b* le fera ton P^1C^2 ne le te fera pas.

METRE V.

1 couvient: A^3P^4B couviendra; donter (C^1A^1): P^2M douter $C^2BP^1P^3A^2A^3DS$ doubter *R* doub P^4 dompter.
2 resnes (P^1C^2R): BC^1P^2DS regnes P^3 reines A^1A^2M renes.
3 Inde: P^1 judee C^1 *corrupt;* tremble: *D* tramblece *S* trembleche.
5 tes (chet.): *D* de.
6 chetivez: A^3P^4 derraines C^1 caitives.

PROSE VI.

2 tragiciens: P^1 tragicien A^1 traicien.
3 gloire: *once only* BP^2DS; n'est autre chose: P^1 *repeated;* aus milliers: C^1 es m. B aus meilleurs P^2DSA^1M au millier P^3 en m.
4 souflaiz: B souffleis C^2b souffles C^1 soufflemens; en: *BDS* as.
5-6 et . . . laide: *BR om.*
5 et de tel: P^1M et de cel P^2 car de t.
6 sont loé (*a*): *b* (*except D*) plus sont l. D sont plus l.
8 aquisez ces loenges: *b inverted;* (*B*: il avenoit par leurs merites qui il eussent aquises quelles ch. . .).
9 homme: P^2DS *om.* *B* (des sages) hommes.
10 paroles: P^2 nouveles *DS* dis.
11 aussi (*Rb*): $P^1C^1C^2B$ ainsi (ainssin, ensi).
12 estanduz *ou acreuz* (*a*): *b inverted.*
13 couviengne: *B* convient.
14 aus qui(ex): *B* aussi; avient: $P^3A^1A^2M$ couvient.
15 cuidez: P^2DS cuideras; qu'il (BP^3): P^1C^2 que *the rest* qui; *et*: P^1C^2 *om.*; il couvient que il: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; il: P^2 cis *D* chils S cilz.
16 prochaine: $P^3A^1A^2M$ plus grant.
17 cuide (P^1C^2): *BRDS* cuit P^2 quit C^1 cui $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy; soit neis: P^1 *inverted.*
19 comme ($P^1C^2A^2$): *the rest* comment.
20 *vilz*: P^2 vois *D* wis *S* vis; est (estr.): P^1C^2 *om.*

soit une loenge venans de meritez de parens. Et se loenge fait gentillece, il couvient que cil soient gentilz qui sont loé. Pour quoy il s'ensuit que, se tu n'as ta propre gentillece, estrange gentillece ne te fait pas gentil. Mais certez, s'il a riens de bien en gentillece, je croi que ce seulement y est: que il semble que li gentil soient a ce contraint que il couviengne que il ne forlignent pas de la vertu de leurs noblez parans. (19*va*)

[METRE VI.]

Touz li lignagez des hommes qui sont es terres sourt de semblable nessement, car uns seus est pere des chosez, uns seus aministre toutez chosez. Cil donna au solleil ses rais et donna a la lune ses cornes, cil donna les hommes aus terres et les estoillez au ciel, cil enclost de membrez les ames qui de son hault siege vindrent. Donques viennent tuit li mortel homme de noble semence.

Pour quoy vous vantéz vous de vostre lignage et de vos besaeus? Se tu regardez vos commencemens et dieu votre faiseur, nulz ne est forlignablez ne vilains, s'il ne norrist son courage en vicez et deguerpist son propre naissement.

[PROSE VII.]

Mais que te dirai je des deliz du corps, des quiex li desiriers est plains de angoisse, et li saoulemens est plains de repentance? Con grans maladies et con grans douleurs non souffrables, aussi comme un fruit de felonnie, seulent cist delit raporter aus corps de ceulz qui en usent! De ces deliz ne sai je pas *quelle joie ne* quelle leesce viengne de leur esmouvement, mais je sai bien que, quiconques voudra remembrer ses delicieusez luxurez, il entendra que les issuez *et les fins* des deliz sont *dolereusez et* tristez . Et se cil delit peuent faire les beneureus, il couvient donques que les bestes muez soient aussi dites beneurees des quiex toute l'entencion se haste *de saouler* et de raemplir le parfont ventrail de leur corps. Certes tres honneste fust la joieuseté de fame et de enfans, mais l'en a aucune foiz trouvé trop hors de nature que ne sai quiex peres ont esté tourmentéz (19*vb*) par leurs enfans; des quiex combien *greveuse et* mordant en soit toute la condicion, *soit de fame ou de enfans,* il n'est pas mestiers que je le te die, car tu l'as bien autrefoiz esprouvé et encorez en es tu ores angoisseus. En ce

---

22 de (parens): *Bb* (*except M*) des.
22-4 il couv. . . . propre gentillece: *R om.*
24 estrange gentillece: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 estr. noblece; te fait pas: P^1 te fai pas *B* fait pas toy C^1 te poet faire.
25 il a: *b* il i a.
26 il semble que: *B om.*; contraint (RP^2; constraint *CDS*): *the rest* contrains (*B* constrains); couviengne: P^1C^2 couvient.
27 forlignent ($BC^1P^3A^1A^2D$): P^2S fortlignent *M* forslignent P^1C^2 folignent *R* follignent.

METRE VI.

The whole meter is lacking in A^3.
1 qui . . . terres: *b om.*; sourt (*b*; *in M erased and left incomplete* sou): *a* sont.
2 nessement: *b* nessance.
2-3 uns seus am. . . . chosez: *b om.*
3 ses rais: C^1 sa clarte; et donna: C^1 *om.*; cil donna (C^2BRDSP^4): C^1 *om.* P^1P^2 il d. $P^3A^1A^2M$ cellui d.
4 les hommes aus terres: C^1 as hommes la terre; et: P^1C^2 *om.*; cil (encl.): $P^1P^2C^2$ il $P^3A^1A^2M$ cellui; de (mem.) (*a*): P^2DS des $P^3A^1A^2MP^4$ es.
6 semence: *R* science.
7 vantéz: P^1 ventez; besaeus (P^2; e ***inserted between*** a ***and*** u ***probably in a later hand***): A^1A^2 beseaus *M* beseaux P^3 besayeulz C^1 vies aiouls DSP^4a (*except* C^1) besans.
8 tu: BP^4 vous; et . . . faiseur: P^1C^2 *om.*; forlignablez: *M* fortlignable *B* forlinables *D* forlinages *S* fourlignies.
9 deguerpist (A^1A^2; *a except* C^1): *M* deguerpit C^1P^2DS deguerpisse P^4 deguerpissent P^3 delaisse.

PROSE VII.

1 te: P^2DS *om.*; dirai: BRP^2A^2M diroie P^3A^1 diroi.
. **2** de (ang.) . . . plains: *DS om.* (*D places this passage further along after* "De ces deliz"); saoulemens: P^1C^2 oulemens; repentance: P^1 penitence repentance C^1 penit. et de rep. C^2 penitance repentante.
3 souffrables: P^1 souffrable; aussi: P^1 ainsi; felonnie: P^1 felonniez.
7 *fins*: *B* fruis: *dolereusez*: *B* dolereux.
8 donques: *b om.*
9 aussi: P^1P^3 ainsi.
10 le parfont: P^2 *om.*
11 trouvé trop hors: *B* trop.

conferme je *et loe* la sentence de mon deciple Euripedes qui dist que hom qui n'a nulz enfans est par sa maleurté beneuréz.

[METRE VII.]

Chascuns deliz a ceste proprieté: il maine par aguillons ceulz qui de lui usent. Il resemble les ees volans; la ou la mouche a espandu son dous miel, elle s'en fuit et fiert par trop tenable mors les cuers de ceulz qui l'ont receu *et y laisse son aguillon.*

[PROSE VIII.]

Or n'est il donques nulle doubte que ces voies ne soient unes desvoiabletéz *et uns destourbemens* de venir a beneurté, ne ne peuent mener nul homme la ou elles le prometent a mener. Mais je te monstrerai tres briefment de con grans malz elles sont enlaciees. Car pour quoy? Se tu t'esforces a amonceler peccune, tu la fortreras a celui qui l'a. Se tu veulz resplendir de dignitéz, tu supplieras a celui qui les donne. Se tu veulz par honneur aler devant les autres, tu t'avilleras par humillité de requerre. Se tu desires a avoir puissance, tu seras *redevablez et* sommis aus aguiez de tes sugéz et gerras souz pluseurs perilz. Se tu requiers gloire, tu seras detréz et demenéz par tant de aspretéz que tu faudras a estre seurs. Se tu veulz mener ta vie par delicez, chascun te despira et te deguerpira comme serf a chose tres vilz et tres foible, *c'est a savoir* a ton corps. Or apert donques ja comme cil s'apuient a petite et a foible possession qui metent les biens du corps au dessus de leur raison. (20*ra*) Car pourréz vous seurmonter les elefans *de grandeur et* de pesantume de corps et seurmonteréz vous de force les toreaus? Serés vous plus isneaus que les tigres? Regardéz l'espace du ciel et la fermeté et l'inesleté et laissiéz aucune foiz *a loer et* a merveillier les vilz chosez. Certez on ne se doit pas merveillier du ciel plus pour ces chosez que pour sa raison par quoi il est gouvernéz. Mais la biauté de forme, comment est elle ravissable et isnele et plus fuians que la muableté des fleurs de printemps! Car, si comme dit Aristotez, se li hommes eussent yeulz de lins, si que leurs regars tresperçast les chosez

---

16 dist: *BRb* (*except* A^1S) dit.
17 nulz enfans: *B* nul mal; est: P^1C^2 *om.*

METRE VII.

1 Chascuns: A^1A^2MDS aucuns P^2 aucuns (*erased and corrected to* tous) P^3 tout; ceste: A^3P^4B sa; proprieté: P^4 propserite *B* psperite; lui: $P^2P^3A^1A^2B$ li A^3P^4 leur.
2 ees: A^3P^4 cerfs *B* cers C^1S es; la mouche: *D* elle *S* elles; a espandu: *D* a respandu *S* ont r.: dous: P^1C^2 *om.*
3 mors: P^1 meurs.
4 *y laisse son*: A^3P^4 il l. par.

PROSE VIII.

1 ces: P^1BR ses.
1-2 desvoiabletéz: P^1 desvorabletez.
2 *destourbemens*: *B* destour; de venir a ben.: *b om.*
2-3 a beneurté . . . mener: *B om.*
3 monstrerai: *S* demonstreray DC^1 monsterrai P^1C^2 monstrai.
4 briefment: P^1 brisment.
5 peccune ($P^3A^1A^2M$): *the rest* peccunes; la: *DS* les; l'a: *DS* les a.
6 tu (veulz): P^1 *om.*
7 t'avilleras: *C* ta uilliras *DS* te travilleras P^2 traveilleras (*expunged*) *M* traveilleras (te *superscript*) *B* tesuielleras.
8 aguiez ($P^1C^2A^1A^2M$): P^2 aguies (i *deleted*) *RD* agues P^3 aguetz C^1 agais *B* esgies *S* esques.
9 sugéz (P^1R): A^1 subges P^3M subgetz C^1-P^2DS sougis A^2 subgis C^2 sougiez *B* subgiez.
10 detréz et: *B om.*; faudras: C^1 defaurras.
11 te despira et te deguerpira (P^1C^2R): *b* (*except S*) te desp. et guerpira *S* te faurra et despirra C^1 te desprisera et te guerpira *B* te deguerpira.
12 a chose: $P^3A^1A^2M$ et ch. C^1 as coses; a (ton): P^1 *om.*
13 donques ja (*BR*; dont ja C^1): $P^2P^3A^2DM$ *inverted S* il ja d. A^1 il dont P^1C^2 donques la; comme ($P^1C^2A^1$): *the rest* comment; a (foible): $P^1C^1A^2$ *om.*; possession (*a*): *b* poissance.
14 pourréz: *b* pourries.
14-15 pourréz . . . elefans: *R* pour ce nous sourmontons enfans *B* poures nos sormonte les elephans.
15 pesantume: P^3MS pesanteur.
15-16 seurmonteréz (P^1C^2RS): *b* (*except* P^2S) sourmonteries P^2 sourmonteroies C^1 sormonterons *B* sormontez.
17 Regardéz: *B* se (*verb lacking*); et laissiéz: *B* est l.
18 ne se doit pas: P^3A^1 ne doit soy pas A^2M ne doit pas soi *DSR* ne se doibt mie.
20 biauté: C^1 bialte *S* beaulte C^2 bleaute; forme: P^1B fortune *b* forme d'omme.
22 li: P^1 *om.*; de lins: *B* deliz; tresperçast (*a*): *b* percast.

contrestans, qui regarderoit dedens les entraillez le corps Alcipiades qui tres biaus estoit en la superfice dehors, il apparroit trop lais. Se tu donques semblez estre biaus, ce ne fait pas *ta forme ou* ta nature, mais *la decevance et* la foiblece des yeulz qui te regardent. Mais prisiéz les biens du corps a si tres grant pris comme vous vouléz, mais que vous sachiéz totevois que ce que vous *loés et* prisiéz puet estre destruit par la chaleur d'une fievre de trois jours. Donques puis je bien de toutez ces chosez ce ramener briefment a une somme: que cist bien *mondain* qui ne peuent donner ce que il prometent ne ne sont parfait par l'amoncelement de touz biens, qu'il ne sont pas chemins *ne sentiers* qui portent hommes a beneurté ne ne les parfont estre beneuréz.

[METRE VIII.]

Halas! halas! *quelle folie,* quelle ignorance fortrait les chetis desvoiables du sentier de vraie beneurté! Vous ne queréz pas or en arbre vert ne ne cuilliéz gemmes en la vigne, (20*rb*) vous *ne tendéz pas ne* ne reponéz vos laz es haultez montaingnez pour prendre les poissons. Ou s'il vous plaist a chacier *aus cers et* aus bichez, vous n'aléz pas aus guéz de Tuscanne. Et sevent enseurquetout li homme les destors de la mer repos dedens les floz, et scevent quelle eaue est plus plantereuse de pierres precieusez et scevent quelle eaue habonde plus de *poissons dont l'en taint les* roigez pourpres et scevent quiex rivagez habondent plus *et valent miex* de poissons tendrez et des asprez. Mais il se seuffrent estre si avuglez que il n'ont cure de savoir en quel lieu se repoigne le bien que il couvoitent, si que il se plungent en terre et requierent illec le bien qui seurmonte le ciel qui porte les estoillez. Quelle priere puis je faire qui soit digne *et convenable* aus folez pensees des hommes? *Certes je ne sai fors que ceste: je pri* que il couvoitent richecez et honneurs pour ce que, quant il auront aquis par grant travail les faulz biens, que il cognoissent lors les vrais biens, *c'est la vraie beneurté.*

[PROSE IX.]

Or nous suffise jusques ci que nous avons demonstré la forme *de la fausse*

---

23 contrestans: P^3 contraitans *B* contre tant; Alcipiades (*DSM*): C^1 Alecipiades $P^2P^3A^1A^2$ Alchipiades P^1C^2 Accipiades *BR* Acipiades.

24 apparroit; $P^1C^1C^2A^1A^2S$ apparoit P^3 apperroit (?) D appartient.

25 *ou* ta nature (*a*): *b* (*except* P^2S) naturele P^2S naturel.

26 prisiéz: $P^1A^1A^2$ prisez *R* prise.

27 comme vous vouléz: P^3 *om.* *DS* que vous vaurres.

29-30 de toutez ces (*b om.*) chosez ce (P^3 *om.*) ramener (C^1 remembrer) *so read by* BRC^1b (A^1A^2M: ramener ce): P^1C^2 toutez ces (P^1 ses) chosez ram.

30 a: $C^1P^2P^3$ en.

31 sont: P^1 *om.*: par: P^1 *om.*

32 qu'il: P^1C^1 ne.

33 les: P^1 le; beneuréz: *BR insert, after* beneuréz, *the second sentence of Meter VIII, l.* 2: vous ne querez . . . vigne.

METRE VIII.

1 *folie:* P^1C^2 felonnie.

2-3 vous . . . vigne: A^3P^4 *om.* *BR* cf. *above* Prose VII. l. 33.

2 or en arbre: *b* l'or en l'arbre; arbre vert: *B* arbres vers.

3 cuilliéz gemmes: C^2 cueilliez g. *BR* cueilliez jamais C^1 queilliez james *b* cueil. pas les (P^2 *om.*) pierres precieuses; *tendéz pas: followed by* vos rois (P^2DS) voz reiz (P^3A^1) v. rais (A^1M); reponéz: $P^1C^2A^3$ reprouvez C^1 reponnies.

3-4 vos laz (aA^3P^4): *b om.* C^1 *after tendéz pas* (tendies p.).

5 n'aléz: *D* ne les prenez; guéz: A^3P^4 geus *B* gens *R* ges.

6 sevent: A^3P^4 ce n'est pas; enseurquetout: A^3 sur tous que P^3 presque tous.

8 *l'en taint:* *R* lentent; roigez: *the rest* rouges.

10 des (asprez): bBA^3P^4 *om.*; estre si avuglez: *S* ainsi estre avulle P^1 estre av. si.

11 repoigne ($P^1C^2RP^3A^1A^2$): *M* reponne P^2 repoignent BP^4 reponnent C^1D repont.

12 le (bien): BRC^1P^4b cellui (celui, celi).

13 priere: P^1 pierre A^3 chose P^4 *om.*; puis je: P^1C^2 puisse je A^3 puisse ay je.

14 *Certes . . . fors:* P^3 nulle autre; *Certes . . . ceste:* *B om.*

15 pour . . . quant: $P^1C^2P^2$ pour ce q. P^3 afin que q. A^3 car q. P^4 quant.

16 que . . . biens: A^3P^4B *om.*

16-17 *c'est . . . beneurté:* C^1P^3 *om.*

PROSE IX.

1 ci (P^1C^2R): *b* (*except* P^3) C^1 a ci (achi) BP^3 ici; que: C^1BRb ce que P^2 que se.

et de la mençongiere beneurté et, se tu la regardez bien soutilment, li ordres *de nostre entencion* requiert que nous demonstrons des ore en avant quiex est la beneurté vraie."

"Certes", je dis, "je voi bien que suffisance ne puet venir par richecez, ne puissance par royaumes, ne reverance *ne honneur* par dignitéz, ne gentillece par gloire *ne par renommee mondaine,* ne leesce par deliz." "Et as tu (20*va*) aussi cogneu les causez pour quoy il est ainsi?" "Certes, il me semble que je les voi tenurement aussi comme par un petit pertuis, mais je voudroie miex que tu les me feissez encores entendre plus apertement."

"Certes, il y a tres preste raison. Car la chose qui est *une et* simple ne ne puet estre devisee, erreur *et folie* humaine la depart *et devise* et la *destourne et* transporte du bien vrai et parfait au bien faus et non parfait. Or me di: Cuidez tu que ce qui a souffraite *et faute* de puissance ne ait de riens souffraite *ne besoing?*" "Ce ne cuide je pas", di je. "Certez tu dis *bien* a droit. Car s'il est riens qui en aucune partie soit de plus foible puissance, en ceste couvient il que il soit souffraiteus de aide estrange." "Ainsi est", dis je. "Suffisance donques et puissance sont d'une meismes nature." "Ainsi me est il avis", dis je. "Et juges tu que chose qui est de ceste maniere doie estre despite, ou se elle est tres digne seur toutez chosez de reverance *et de honneur?*" "Certez", dis je, "de ce ne puet nulz doubter." "Ajustons donques a suffisance et a puissance reverance, si que nous jugons que ces trois chosez soient une seule chose." "Certez, ajustons li seurement, se nous voulons recognoistre verité."

"Que dis tu donques", dist elle. "Juges tu que celle chose *suffisant, puissant, honorable* soit vilz et oscure, ou se elle est *tres noble et* tres clere par celebrité de renommee? Mais or regarde—ce que nous avons ottroié qu'il est suffisans a soi meismes et n'a besoing ne souffraite de riens et est tres puissant et tres digne de honneur—savoir mon, se ceste chose a souffraite *ou* (20*vb*) *faute* de noblece que elle ne se puisse donner, si que elle semble estre d'aucune partie plus vilz *et plus despite.*" "Ce ne puis je pas," dis je, "*regarder,* ains me couvient il ottroier si comme il est, c'est a savoir que ceste chose soit neis tres celebrable *par clarté de noblece.*" "Donques s'ensuit il que *nous ajustons* clarté de noblece aus trois chosez dessus dites, si que il n'ait entreus nulle difference?" "Ci a bonne consequence", dis je. "Ce donques qui n'a mestier de nulle chose estrange et qui puet faire toutez chosez par ses forces et qui est noble et honorable, n'est ce donques chose tres liee *et tres joieuse?*" "Mais a ceste chose tele, dont li pourroit", dis je, "venir *ou courrous* ou douleur, ce ne puis je mie certez neis penser."

"Donques nous couvient il ottroier que celle chose soit plaine de leesce,

---

6 ne (rev.): $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; *ne honneur*: *DS om.* P^2 ne poissance C^1 ne honneurs.

7 *ne par renommee*: P^3 *om.*; ne . . . deliz: P^2 *om.*

8 aussi (C^1b): *a* (*except* C^1) ainsi.

9 les: $P^1C^2A^2D$ le; tenurement: P^3A^2 tenrement P^2 tan vement *D* tenueuement.

11 preste: P^1C^2 petite; *une et* simple: *b inverted*; ne ne: P^1C^2 ne.

12 *et folie*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; la (*dest.*): P^1C^2 *om.*

13 au . . . parfait: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 aussi bien vrai et non p. *B* aus biens fais et non parfais.

14 souffraite: *D* souffisance.

15 cuide je: *DS* cuit je *B* cuides tu $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy je.

16 a droit: C^1BRb et droit; s'il: P^2 si P^1 cil.

20 doie: *B* doit.

22 jugons ($P^1C^1BP^2DSA^2$): C^2A^1 jugeons *M* jugiens *R* jugains P^3 jugions.

23 chose: P^2DS *om.*

24 recognoistre: P^1 cognoistre.

25 *suffisant*: A^1 soufisamment A^2DB souffis (*abbreviated*) P^3 suffise.

26 se: P^1 ce.

28 qu'il (C^2BR): $P^1P^2C^1$ qui $P^3A^1A^2M$ que ce qui *DS* que ce.

29 se: P^1 ce.

30 se: P^1C^2R *om.*

31 *et*: BRP^2DS ou.

33 chose: *BDS om.*; soit neis: A^1A^2MDS *inverted*; neis: P^3 *om.*; de (*a*): *b* et.

37-8 n'est ce: P^1C^2 n'est *D* en ceste.

38 chose: BP^2 *om. in DS inserted after* liee, *in* $P^3A^1A^2M$ *after* joieuse; tele: P^1C^2 celle C^1 tel.

39 *ou courrous*: P^1C^2 touz jours *B om.*

39-40 ce . . . penser: P^2 *om.*

41 aussi: $P^1C^1C^2R$ ainsi (ainssint).

se les chosez dessus ditez sont vraiez. Et certez aussi vous couviant il ce ottroier que suffisance, puissance, noblece, leesce, reverance sont seulement diversez par nons, mais leur sustance n'a nulle diversité." "Ce couvient il", dis je. "Celle chose donques, qui est une et simple en sa nature, la malvaistié des hommes la depart *et devise* et, quant il s'esforcent a consuivre partie de chose qui est sens partie, il n'aconsuivent ne celle partie qui est nulle ne celle chose meismes que il ne desirent pas." "En quel maniere?" dis je.

"Cil", dist elle, "qui quiert richecez pour fuir pouvreté ne se travaille pas pour puissance; il veult miex estre vilz et occurs et soutrait neis a soi meismes mains deliz naturex, pour ce que il ne perde la peccune que il a (21*ra*) assemblee. Et par ceste maniere meismes n'aconsuit pas suffisance cil que puissance delaisse et que tristece point et que vilté degete et que occurté repont. Et certes cil qui desire puissance seulement, il degaste richeces, il despit deliz et honneur qui est sens puissance et ne prise gloire neis niant. Mais certez tu vois bien que moult de chosez defaillent a cestui, car il a aucune foiz besoing d'avoir ses necessitéz et le mordent maintez angoissez et, comme il ne puisse pas ces chosez oster, il delaisse neis a estre puissans et ce est ce que il plus requeroit. Et aussi poons nous faire semblablez raisons des honneurs et de gloire et des deliz. Car comme chascune de ces chosez soit ce meismes que toutez les autres sont, quiconques requiert l'une de cestes sans les autres, certez il n'aconsuit pas neis celle que il desire."

"Que diraiez tu donques", dis je, "se aucuns les vouloit toutez aconsuivre ensemble?" "Certez je diraie que cil requerroit la souveraine beneurté. Mais celle ne trouvera il pas es chosez que nous avons demonstreez qui ne puent donner ce que elles prometent." "Certes", dis je, "non". "Donques ne doit on en nulle maniere querir beneurté es chosez que on croit qui puissent donner senglement aucune des chosez que on requiert." "Je le recognois", dis je, "ne nulle plus vraie chose ne puet estre dite." "Or as tu donques", dist elle, "et la forme et les causez de la fausse beneurté. Or flechis *et tourne* d'autre part le regart de ta pensee; car la verras tu tantost celle vraie beneurté que nous te promeismes."

"Certez", dis je, "elle est (21*rb*) ja toute aperte neis a un avugle et tu la me monstras un pou devant, quant tu te esforçaies a descouvrir les causez de la fausse beneurté. Car se je ne sui deceuz, celle est la vraie et la perfecte beneurté qui perfectement fait homme suffisant, puissant, honorable, noble et plain de leesce. Et pour ce que tu cognoissez que je ai bien entendu ces chosez dedens mon cuer, je cognois que celle beneurté qui puet vraiement donner une des chosez dessus dites, puis que elles sont

43 seulement: P^2DS *om.*
45 une: P^1 nue.
46 a consuivre (*a except R*; A^1): RP^2DSA^2M a aconsuivre (-suire, -sieurre) P^3 aconsuivre.
47 il . . . partie: *D om.*; aconsuivent (-sievent, *etc*): P^1 na couvient; ne: *b* pas.
48 ne desirent pas: *b* desirent.
51 soi (*a*): *b* lui (P^2 li).
52 mains: P^1 moins *D* mez.
53 aconsuit: P^1C^2DS a. il; n'aconsuit pas: C^1 n'a pas conscience.
54 cil que puissance: *R* ce qui souffisance.
57 cestui (*a*): *b* cellui (P^2 celi).
58 d'avoir ses: *B* de assez de; ses: P^1C^2 ces.
59 oster: P^1C^2 *om.*; il delaisse neis (*BR*): P^1C^2 il laisse neis C^1 il ne delaisse pas *b* il delesse.
60 aussi: P^1 ainsi C^1 ensi.
61 semblablez raisons: $P^2A^1A^2M$ -ble reson P^3 semblablement; et (de gl.): BP^3DS *om.*; de gloire: $P^1C^1C^2B$ des gloires.
62 de ces (C^1P^2DS): *the rest* de toutez ces; ce: P^1C^2 soi P^2 de.
63 cestes: *B* ces choses.
65 aconsuivre: P^1 ensuivre C^2 asíure.
66 cil: *B* se il; requerroit: *a* requeroit.
70 puissent: *B* ne p.; senglement: *DS* saí*n*glement P^3 simplement; le: P^1C^2 *om.*
71 recognois: *BS* cognois.
72 forme: *B* f. et la maniere.
73 d'autre: *DS* de l'aut.; la verras tu: P^1C^2 ja verras.
76 pou (C^1C^2BR): P^1 petit *b* pou ci (pau chi); a: P^1 de.
77-8 Car . . . beneurté: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
77 sui: P^1 sai.
78 puissant: *B* puis sont.
79 pour ce: P^3 a fin.
81-2 sont toutez (P^1B): *the rest inverted*.

toutez une, je cognois sans doubtance que iceste est la plaine beneurté." "O", dist elle, "li mien filz, je dis que tu es beneuréz par ceste cognoissance, se tu y ajustes ceste chose." "Quelle chose?" dis je. "Cuidez tu que il ait riens en ces chosez terriennes mortex et decheablez qui puisse cest estat aporter?" "Certez", dis je, "je ne le cuide pas et tu m'as ja monstré que nulle chose ne soit desiree oultre ceste."

"Ces chosez donques ou elles semblent estre ymages du vray bien, ou il semble que elles doignent aus mortiex hommes aucuns biens non mie parfaiz; mais celui bien vray et parfait ne peuent elles pas donner." "Je m'y acort", dis je. "Pour ce donques que tu as cogneu quiex est celle vraie beneurté, et quiex sont les chosez qui mentent que vraie beneurté soit en eulz, or recouvient que tu cognoissez dom tu puisses celle vraie beneurté requerir." "Certes", dis je, "ce *desire je moult et* l'aten et l'ai longuement atendu a oir." "Mais pour ce", dist elle, "si comme il plaist a nostre deciple Platon ou livre de Thimee, es chosez neis tres petitez doit estre requise la divine aide, (21*va*) que jugez tu que nous doions faire pour ce que nous deservons a trouver le siege de celui souverain bien?" "Certes", dis je, "je juge que nous devons apeler le pere de toutez chosez, car sens lui nulz commencement n'est fondéz a droit." "Tu dis voirs", dist elle et commença lors ainsi a chanter:

[METRE IX]

O tu peres, createurs du ciel et de la terre, qui gouvernes cest monde par pardurable raison, qui commandez que li temps aille de pardurableté (*des lors que aagez out commencement*), qui es estable et ne te meuz et faiz toutez chosez mouvoir, ne onques estrangez causez ne te esmurent a former euvre de matere flotant *et transmuable,* mais la forme du souverain bien assise en toy sans envie te meut tant seulement; tu traiz toutez chosez de ton souverain examplaire; tu, tres biaus, portez le biau monde dedens ta pensee et formes cestui monde a l'ymage et a la semblance de celui et commandez que cist mondez parfaiz ait ses partiez delivres et parfaitez. Tu lies les elemens par certains nombres pour ce que les froidez chosez se puissent acorder aus chaudez et les sechez aus moistez, si que li feu plus purs ne vole pas trop hault et que li faiz ne face pas trop abessier les terres plungiees es caues. Tu *enlaces et* conjoins au corps l'ame moienne de treble nature qui toutez chosez muet et la devisez par acordables membrez. Et quant elle est ainsi devisee et a assemblé son mouvement en deus manierez de rondes esperes, elle trespasse a retourner a soi meismes et (21*vb*)

---

82 doubtance (*a*): *b* doubte.
84 ajustes: P^1C^2 ajuste; chose: C^1BRb *om.*
85 ait: P^2DS y ait; decheablez (BP^2DS): P^1C^2 delitablez *R* decevables C^1 dechuables $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; puisse: *B* puissent.
88 vray bien: P^1 *inverted.*
89 semble: P^1C^2 semblent.
92 et quiex . . . beneurté: P^2DSA^2 *om.*; mentent: P^1 metent *BR* maintiennent; soit: *DS* nest mie.
94 aten (P^1C^2): *BRD* atent C^1 ateng P^3M attens *S* attench.
97 doions: C^2 deons P^3 devons *marginal.*
98 deservons ($P^1C^1C^2BS$): *R* deservains P^2A^2M deserviens P^3A^1 deservions.
99 devons: P^1C^2 deons.

METRE IX.

1 O: *b* (*except M*) *om.*; tu: *BM om.*; createurs: C^1b *om.*: gouvernes: P^1 gouverne; cest: *Bb* (*except* P^2) ce P^2 le.
2 aille: *DS* voist; de (*a*): *b* par.
3 *out* (P^1C^2): *Rb* ot *DS* eut BC^1 est; meuz (P^1C^2R): BC^1b mues.
4 mouvoir: P^1C^2 esmouvoir.
5 matere: P^1C^2 maistre.
6 sans envie: P^1C^2 *om.*; te meut (P^1C^2; P^3 te muet): BC^1P^4b (*except* P^3P^2) te mut P^3 t'esmut *R* de mut: tant: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
7 examplaire (P^4a; *R* essamplaire): *b* exemple (P^2 essample); biau (P^1B): P^4 beau C^2 bleau *R om.* *b* bel (*S* biel) C^1 bel du.
9 delivres: P^1 delivrees (*cf. infra Prose X,* 1. 16).
11 plus (*a*): *b om.* (*R*: qui est plus pur).
12 que (li faiz): P^2 *om.*; pas (trop) (P^1C^2): *the rest om.*
13 eaues: *BRDS* yaues; moienne: *R* meanne *B* meue: treble: C^1 tresble A^1 triple P^3 trouble P^4 tres belle.
14 muet (moet, meut): BP^4 vaint.
15 a assemblé (C^1; *b except DS*): *R* a ensemble *B* a assembles P^1C^2 assemble *DS* assemblee.
16 rondes esperes (P^1C^1R): C^2P^4 roondes

avironne *et enquiert* la parfonde pensee de dieu et tournoie le ciel par ymaginacion semblable, *si comme elle voit que dieu le veult.* Tu *par semblables et* par pareillez causez essaucez les ames et les vies meneurs et, quant tu les as ajusteez en hault par legieres veictures (*par raison et entendement*), tu les semes ou ciel et en la terre; et quant elles sont a toy convertiez par ta debonnaire loy, tu les faiz a toy retourner par remenable amour.

Tu peres, *qui tiex es,* donne a nostre pensee monter a ton siege royal; donne li avironner la fontaine de bien et, par ycelle clarté trouvee, donne li fichier du tout en toy les regars de nostre courage, si que nous te puissions clerement veoir. *Derompt et* despiece les nublecez et les faiz de la pesenteur terrienne et nous esclarcis par ta resplendisseur. Car tu es clartéz, tu es pesiblez repos *aus debonnaires et* aus piteus, tu es a nous commencemens, portierrez, menierrez, sentiers; tu meismes es termes *oultre cui n'a riens.* Toy regarder est nostre fins.

[PROSE X.]

Pour ce donques que tu as veu quiex est la forme du bien non parfait et quiex est neis la forme du bien parfait, or croi je qu'il seroit bon a demonstrer en quoi ceste perfection de beneurté est assise. En ce croi je que nous devons premierement enquerir, savoir mon, se aucuns itiex biens, comme celui que tu as defeni un petit ci devant, puisse estre trouvéz en la nature des chosez, pour ce que vaine ymaginacion de pensee ne nous deçoive et mete hors de la verité de celle chose qui nous est soumise *et de* (22*ra*) *quoi nous entendons.* Mais que cil biens ne soit, et qu'il ne soit aussi comme une fontaine de touz autres biens, ce ne puet on pas nier. Car toute chose qui est dite non parfaite est prouvee non parfaite par l'amenuisement de perfection *ou de chose parfaite.* Dont il avient que en chascune chose general, se on i voit riens non parfait, certez en ce general couvient estre aucune chose parfaite. Car se perfection est ostee, on ne puet *ne dire* ne penser neis dont celle chose soit qui est dite non parfaite. Car la nature des chosez ne prist pas son commencement des chosez amenuisies et non parfaitez, ainçois vient des chosez enterines et delivrez et descent en ces derrenieres chosez *foraines* et sens fruit. Mais, si comme nous avons monstré un petit ci devant, s'il est une fraile et vaine et non parfaite

---

especes *B* r. espouses *b* rondesces; a (retourner): *b* au: a (soi): C^1b en.

18 *voit:* P^1C^2B veult.

19 meneurs (*M*: mineur): P^1C^2 meismes.

20 veictures: BP^2DS voitures P^3 voictures *M* vectures A^1A^2 veitures *R* vainturs P^4 faictures; *raison*: *B* traison.

21 les: P^1 le.

21-2 quant . . . convertiez (*a*): *b om.*

21 sont a toy: C^1 soient.

22 tu (*a*): *b om.*; remenable ($P^1C^2BRP^3$; C^1P^4 rema- A^1M rame-): A^2 amenable P^2 resnable *DS* regnable.

24 *tiex* ($P^1RP^2A^1$): C^1DS tels *B om.* C^2 tielz A^2 celz *M* tel P^3 tes (*for* tiex es); a (ton): C^1b (*except* A^1A^2) en.

25 li: *b om.*; et: P^1 *om.*

26 li: *b om.*; du tout en toy: P^1C^2M *inverted.*

27 puissions: *the rest* puissons; *Derompt* (P^1M): RA^1A^2 deromp P^2 deront C^2 derump P^3 desromp *DS* desront *B* desrons P^4 desromps C^1 deronge; despiece: C^1 depeche *D* depieche P^4 despieces.

29 nous: P^1 nos C^2 noz.

30 portierrez . . . sentiers: $P^3A^1A^2M$ porteur meneur sentier; sentiers: P^1C^2 sentierres.

30-1 *n'a riens:* *B* varies.

31 fins: *B* sires.

1 que: P^1C^2 *om.*; tu as: P^1C^2 *inverted*; quiex: C^1 quelz C^2b quele.

2 et quiex . . . parfait: *B om.*

3 beneurté: P^1C^2 bien $P^3A^1A^2M$ bonte; croi je: *B* croire.

4 enquerir: *the rest* enquerre (*R* enquierre).

6 nature: *D* matere.

7 deçoive: P^2 deceve *B* mete; et mete: *editor's addition.*

8 *quoi*: *D* toy; cil (*a*): P^2S cils *D* cius $P^3A^1A^2M$ cellui; biens: $BC^2P^3A^1A^2M$ bien C^1 *om.*; et qu'il ne soit: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*

10 parfaite (par): P^1 prouvee.

12 i voit ($BC^1P^2P^3A^1D$): *R* nívoit A^2MS y avoit P^1C^2 met.

14 dite: P^1C^2 *om.*

15 prist: *B* perist; commencement: P^1C^2 conmement.

17 derrenieres: *DS* desraines; *foraines*: DS *om.*

18 petit (P^1C^2): *the rest* pou (poi, po); une fraile: *B* une fontaine f.

beneurté, nulz ne peut doubter qu'il n'en soit aucune ferme, *permanant* et parfaite." "Ceste conclusion", dis je, "est tres ferme et tres vraie."

"Mais ainsi regarde", dist elle, "ou celle beneurté habite. La commune acordance des courages humains preuve *et ottroie* que diex, princes de toutez chosez, est bons. Car comme nulle chose ne puisse estre pensee milleur de dieu, nulz ne pourroit doubter que ce de quoi nulle chose n'est milleur ne soit bons. Certez, raison demonstre que diex est si bons que ele preuve par droite force que parfaiz biens est en lui, car se il n'estoit tiex, il ne pourroit pas estre princes de toutez chosez. Car aucune chose, tenans en soy bien parfait, sera miex vaillans que diex, et semblera que celle chose soit premiere et plus (22*rb*) ancienne que diex—car nous avons monstré apertement que toutez les chosez parfaites sont avant que les chosez non parfaites. Pour quoy, pour ce que nostre raison ne s'en aille sens fin, recognoistre devons que li souverains diex est tres plains du souverain et du parfait bien. Mais nous avons establi que li souverains biens est vraie beneurté; donques couvient il que la vraie beneurté soit assise ou souverain dieu." "Ce reçoif je bien", dis je, "ne ce ne puet estre contredit en nulle maniere."

"Mais je te pri", dist elle, "que tu regardez comment tu puissez ce prouver saintement et sans corruption que nous avons dit que li souverains diex est tres plains du souverain bien." "En quelle maniere?" dis je. "Cuidez tu donques que cil princes de toutez chosez ait pris hors de soy ou s'il a naturelment en soy celui souverain bien de quoy l'en preuve que il est plains—aussi com tu penseroies que diex qui beneurté a en soi et la beneurté qui est en li fussent divers en substance? Car se tu cuidez que il ait celui bien receu de hors, tu pues cuidier que cil qui ce bien donna a dieu est plus vaillant que diex. Mais nous recognoissons tres dignement que diex est tres vaillans seur toutez chosez. Et se cil biens est en li par nature, mais il est divers de li par raison, puis que nous parlons de dieu prince des chosez—faigne qui faindre puet—qui fu cil qui ces chosez diversez pot ensemble conjoindre? Au derrenier, ce qui est divers de chascune chose, l'une n'est pas l'autre dont elle est entendue (22*va*) a estre diverse. Dont il s'ensuit que ce qui par sa nature est divers du souverain bien, ce n'est pas li souverains biens; mais felonnie est a ce penser de celui de qui certainement nulle chose n'est miex vaillans. Car tous jours, de toutez chosez, leur nature ne pourra jamés estre meilleur de son commencement, par quoi je puis conclurre par tres vraie raison que ce qui est commencement de toutez chosez, celle chose neis est en sa

---

19 qu'il: P^1C^2 qui.
21 ainsi (*a except* C^1): C^1b aussi.
24 milleur (P^1DS): C^1 millour P^2 melleur C^2R meillour *the rest* meilleur; doubter: P^2DS penser; de quoi (*b*): P^1 de cui BC^1 de qui R qui de (C^2: que de ce qui).
26 que (parf.): P^1C^2 qui; estoit ($P^1C^1C^2DS$): *BRb* (*except DS*) est.
27 pourroit (P^1C^1DSM): *the rest* pourra.
28 bien: *b om.*
31 chosez (non p.): C^1C^2Rb *om.*
32 recognoistre: P^1 cognoistre; devons: P^1B de nous; tres (*a*): *b* tous (tout).
33-4 souverains biens (C^1RP^2DS): *the rest* -ain bien.
34 (est) vraie: P^1 (est) venue; il: P^1 *om.*
35 assise: *R* atisee; dieu (*a*): *b* bien; reçoif: P^1C^2 recognois.
36 contredit: *B* entredit; nulle: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aucune.
38 prouver: P^3 trouver; et: P^1C^2 *om.*
39 tres: P^1 *om. DS* tous; du (*aMD*): *the rest* de.
41 ou . . . soy: *Bb om.*
42 penseroies: *B* pensoies; que (diex): *DS* de.
43 a: P^2DS soit.
44 ait: *D* l'ait; celui bien: *DS om.*; celui: *R* en lui *B* de lui; cil (*aS*): *the rest* ce.
45-6 Mais . . . diex: C^1 *om.* (*B*: mais nous disons eu renoncant tres dignement).
45 recognoissons: P^1 recognoissions.
46 se: P^1 ce P^2 *om.*; cil (cilz, chils, cis): $P^3A^1A^2M$ ce; li ($P^1C^2P^2D$): *the rest* lui.
47 divers: *R* dignes; li ($P^1C^2BP^2$): *the rest* lui.
49 pot: P^1 les pot; conjoindre (*a*): *b* joindre; ensemble conj.: C^1 assambler et conj.
51 divers: P^1C^2 *om.*
52 a: *D om.*
53 qui: P^1 cui.
55 son: $P^3A^1A^2M$ leur; puis: P^1 puisse.

substance li souverains biens." "Tu as parlé", dis je, "tres droitement." "Mais nous avons ottroié que li souverains biens est beneurté." "C'est voirs", dis je. "Donques", dist elle, "nous convient il ottroier que celle meismes beneurté est diex." "Certez", dis je, "je ne puis aler contre les raisons propousees et bien voy que ce s'ensuit de ces premissez."

"Or regarde", dist elle, "savoir mon, s'il est aussi prouvé plus fermement par ce meismes que deus souverains biens, qui soient divers entre eulz, ne poeent estre. Car certes li bien qui sont divers entre euls, li uns n'est pas ce que li autres est; donques ne pourra ne li uns ne li autres estre parfaiz, comme de chascun d'euz defaille touz jours li uns a l'autre. Mais ce qui n'est mie parfait, c'est tout apert qu'il n'est pas souverain. Les chosez donques qui sont souverainnement bonnes ne peuent en nulle maniere estre diversez. Mais nous avons bien cueilli *et receu* que beneurté et diex sont li souverains biens; par quoi il convient que souveraine beneurté est ce meismes que est souveraine deité." "Nulle chose", dis je, "ne est plus vraie de ceste ne plus ferme par raison, ne plus digne de dieu ne puet estre concluse *ne prouvee.*"

"Seur ces chosez donques", dist elle, "aussi comme li geometrien, quant (22*vb*) il ont demonstré leurs propons, seulent conclurre et ajuster aucunes chosez que il apelent porismes *ou esclarcissemens des chosez devant ditez,* aussi te donrai je ci aussi comme un correlaire *ou un loier de coronne.* Car pour ce que par l'aquisicion de beneurté sont fait li homme beneuré et beneurtéz est deitéz meismes, aperte chose est que par l'aquisicion de divinité sont faiz li homme beneuréz. Mais aussi comme par l'aquisicion de justice sont fait li homme juste et par l'aquisicion de sapience sont fait sage, aussi couvient il par semblable raison que, puis qu'il ont acquise divinité, que il soient fait dieu. Touz homs beneuréz est donques diex; mais certez par nature il n'est que un seul dieu, mais par participacion de divinité nulle chose ne empeeche que il ne soient pluseurs diex." "Ce est", dis je, "bele chose et precieuse; apele la, si comme tu veulz miex, ou porisme ou correlaire *ou esclarcissement ou loier de coronne.*"

"Mais certez nulle chose ne est plus bele de ceste qui, par raison, doit estre ajustee aus chosez devant ditez." "Quelle chose?" dis je. "Comme il semble", dist elle, "que beneurté contiengne pluseurs chosez, savoir mon, se toutez chosez *facent ou* conjoingnent aussi comme un corps de beneurté par aucune diversité de parties ou, savoir mon, se aucune de toutez ycelles soit telle que elle acomplisse par soi la sustance de beneurté, si que toutez ces chosez autres soient raportees a lui." "Je voudroie", dis je, "que tu me feisses entendre clerement ce que tu diz et me recordassez les chosez dessus ditez." "N'avons nous pas", dist elle, "jugié que beneurtéz est biens?" "Oy, certez", dis je, "et souverains." "Ajuste", dist elle, " (23*ra*) ce *bien*

---

57 li: C^1b *om.*
61 premissez: B promesses.
62 aussi ($P^1A^1A^2M$): *the rest* ainsi; ferment: $P^3A^1A^2M$ forment.
63 deus: $P^3A^1A^2M$ de deus.
63-4 ne poeent . . . euls (C^1R): *the rest om.*
65 li autres est: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted;* ne (li uns): P^1C^3 *om.*
66 de: P^1 *om.*; d'euz: BRC^1b des deus; defaille: C^1P^2 faille; touz jours: P^3 chascun.
67 pas souverain: P^3 mie parfait ne s.
68-9 en nulle . . . estre: P^1C^1 estre en n. m. A^2 a nulle m. es. A^1M en nulle estre (*sic*).
69 cueilli: P^3 cuilli D quelli S coelli.
70 li: b *om.* C^2B les; souverains biens: C^1 *sing.*; est (ce m.): BR soit.
71 ce . . . souveraine: B *om.*; deité: B debte.
74 *prouvee*: B promise.
75 propons: B propres b propos; seulent: DS seulement.
76 porismes: B prosmes.
77 ci . . . comme: P^2DS *om.*
79 deitéz: B debte.
85 soient: P^2DS soit.
85-6 Ce est: P^1C^3 certez.
86 bele (a): b bone.
87 porisme: R proisme B proismes; *ou escl. . . . coronne*: P^3 *om.*
89 devant: B dessus.
90 semble (a): b me s.
92 aucune diversité: P^1 aucunes diversitez.
94 autres: b *om.*
96 nous pas: P^1C^2R *om.* C^1 nous; dist elle jugié: Rb *inverted* B jugie de celle C^1 jugie.
97 Ajuste: b aj. donques.

qui est ceste beneurté a toutez les chosez dessus ditez; car celle meismes beneurté est jugiee a estre souveraine suffisance, celle meismes est souveraine puissance, souveraine reverance, souveraine noblece et souverains delit. Que diras tu donques? Toutez ces chosez qui sont par soi bien, c'est a savoir suffisance, puissance et ces autres, sont elles aussi comme uns membres de beneurté, ou se elles sont raportees a bien, aussi comme toutes choses sont rapportees a leur chief?" "Je entens bien", dis je, "ce que tu proposez a encerchier, mais je desire a oir que tu le me monstrez."

"Or pren ainsi la division de ceste question. Se toutez ces chosez fussent membrez de beneurté, elles fussent diversez l'une de l'autre; car telle est la nature des parties que elles, diversez, facent ensemble un corps." "Certez, il a bien esté monstré avant que toutez ces chosez sont une meismes chose." "Donques ne sont elles pas membrez; car autrement sembleroit il que beneurté fust conjointe d'un seul membre, mais c'est chose qui ne puet estre faite." "Ceste chose", dis je, "n'est pas doubteuse, mais je atens a oir ce qui remaint de la question."

"C'est cler que toutez autrez chosez sont raportees a bien. Car pour ce est suffisance requise que elle est jugiee a bien, et pour ce est requise puissance que l'en croit aussi que elle soit biens; et ce meismes poons nous penser de reverance, de noblece et de delit. De toutez les chosez donques que on doit desirer *et requerir* la fin et la cause est biens; car ce qui ne retient nul bien en soi ne semblance de bien, ce ne puet en nulle maniere estre desiré *ne requis*. Et encontre ce, les chosez neis qui par leur nature ne sont pas bonnes, toute- (23*rb*) vois, se on croit que elles soient bonnez, sont elles requisez aussi comme se elles fussent vraiement bonnez. Dont il avient que on doie croire par droit que bonté est la souveraine fin et la cause de toutez les chosez qui sont a requerir. Mais certez, ce qui est cause pour quoi on requiert aucune chose, il semble que ce meismement soit plus desiré, aussi comme si aucuns vouloit chevauchier pour cause de santé, il ne desire pas tant le mouvement de chevauchier comme il desire santé. Come toutez chosez donques soient requisez pour grace de bien, elles ne sont pas desirees de touz plus que bien. Mais nous avons ottroié que beneurté est ce pour quoy ces autres chosez sont desirees; donques est ainsi quise certainement seule beneurté. Dont il apert clerement que de bien et de beneurté est une meismes substance." "Je ne voy riens pour quoy on se puisse de ce descorder." "Mes nous avons monstré que diex et vraie beneurté sont une meismes chose." "C'est voirs", dis je. "Donques poons nous seurement conclurre que la substance de dieu est aussi assise en bien meismes et non pas en aucun lieu autre.

---

98 *qui . . . beneurté*: P^1 qui est de ceste b. *B* qui est fait b.

101 donques Toutez: *B* d. de toutes; ces: P^2DS *om.*; par soi: *DS* p. elles C^2 parfait.

103-4 a bien . . . rapportees: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1 a bien comme.

104 entens: $P^3A^1A^2M$ te en.

105 encerchier: *D* encherquier P^3 enquerir; a (oir): P^1 *om.*

106 pren: *R* apren; ainsi: P^1B aussi C^1 *om.*

107 de (l'autre): P^2DS a.

108 parties: P^2 bestes.

109 avant: P^2 *om.*; une: P^2DS en une.

111 conjointe: P^2 ajointe.

114 que: *B* toutes voies; autrez chosez: *b inverted.*

119 en soi ($P^3A^1A^2M$): *the rest om.*; semblance: C^1 samble.

120 ce, les: $P^3A^1A^2$ celles *M* ces C^1 cels.

121 croit: P^1C^2 les croit; soient: A^1 sont.

122 se elles fussent: P^1C^2 *om.*

124 requerir (requerre): *R* requierre *BS* conquerre *D* acquerre.

125 requiert: *B* requiere; meismement (P^1C^2B): *the rest* meismes (meisme); plus: *b* (*except* P^2) *om.*

127 santé: *B* sentente.

128 pour grace: P^1C^2 par cause.

129 de touz . . . bien: P^2 *om.* *DS* tant que bien meismes.

129-30 Mais . . . desirees: P^2DS *insert further along before the words*: Mes nous avons (*l.* 133). *However DS replace the phrase as follows*: mes nous avons ottroiet que ce est boneurete pour laquelle toutez autrez coses sont desirees.

131 quise ($P^1P^3A^1M$): P^2DS acquise C^2 *qui*^{se} A^2 *que* cest C^1R que *B que*; certainement: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

132 ne: P^1 *om.*; pour: P^1 de.

135 aussi: P^1 ainsi.

136 pas: P^1C^2 *om.* R mie; aucun lieu autre: P^3 auc. aut. lieu *DS* auc. autre P^2 aucun.

[METRE X.]

Venéz tuit ensemble ça qui estes pris et enclaciéz de mauvaisez chaenez par la decevable couvoitise des chosez terriennez habitans en vos pensees! Ici vous sera li repos de vos travaus, ci est li pors establez en pesible repons; cist est li seus apers refuigez aus chetis. Toutez les richecez que Tagus vous donne par ses dorees gravellez ou celles que Hermus donne par sa roige riviere, ou que Indus donne qui est prochains a (23*va*) la chaude partie du monde *qui est par devers midi* qui melle les pierrez verz avec les blanchez, n'esclarcissent pas le regart de nostre pensee, ançois reponnent plus vos couragez avugles dedens leurs tenebrez. Tout quenque ci vous plaist et esmeut vos pensees, la terre le norri en ses basses cavernes. Mais la resplendisseur par quoy li cieulz est gouvernéz et dont il a sa vigueur, celle eschieve les oscures trebuchances de l'ame. Et quiconques pourra noter *et cognoistre* ceste clarté, il dira que li rai du soleil ne sont pas cler."

[PROSE XI.]

"Je m'y acort", dis je, "car toutez ces chosez sont certaines et *vraies et* enlaciees par tres fermes raisons." Lors dist elle: "Combien priseras tu, se je te faiz cognoistre de celui bien quelle chose ce est?" "Par pris sens fin le priseroie", dis je, "s'il m'avenoit que je cogneusse aussi ensemble dieu qui est bien." "Certez", dist elle, "ce te monstrerai je par tres vraie raison, se les chosez que nous avons conclusez un pou ci devant demeurent tant seulement en leur ottroi." "Elles te demourront ottroiees."

"N'avons nous pas", dist elle, "monstré que les chosez qui sont requisez de pluseurs ne sont pas vrais biens ne parfaiz, pour ce que il sont divers li un de l'autre et, comme chascuns uns defaillist a l'autre, il n'ont pooir d'aporter bien plain et absolut; et que lors sont il vrai bien quant il sont lié aussi comme en une forme et en une fesance, si que, ce qui est suffisance, ce meismes soit puissance et reverance, noblece et joieuseté, et que, se toutez ces chosez ne sont une meismes chose, il (23*vb*) n'ont riens pour quoy il soient mis au nombre des chosez que on doit requerir." "C'est demonstré", dis je, "ne de ce ne puet nulz doubter."

"Les chosez donques qui ne sont pas biens quant elles sont diversez, et quant elles commencent a estre une chose elles sont biens—ne leur avient il donques par l'aquisicion de unité que elles soient faites biens?" "Ainsi", dis je, "ce m'est il avis." "Mais toute chose qui est biens, ottroies tu que

---

The complete Metre is lacking in A^3.

1 ça (P^1RP^4; C^2 cza): C^1S *om.* *Bb* (*except* *S*) ci (cy): qui ($P^1C^2P^2$): *the rest* vous qui; pris et (*a*): *b om.*

2 habitans (aP^4): *b om.*

3 ci (chi, cy): C^1 chis *R* cist *B* et; pors: P^1C^2 peres; en: P^1C^2 *om.* *BDS* et; pesible: $P^3A^1A^2M$ plaisant.

4 cist (*BR*): C^1P^2D cis *S* cilz $P^1P^3A^1A^2M$ ci; seus (BC^1P^2): *RDS* seuls $P^3A^1A^2M$ seul P^4 seurs C^2 siens P^1 cieulz; apers refuigez: C^1 espars refuses.

5 richecez: P^4B choses; Tagus: P^2DS Taugus.

5 Hermus: P^1C^2 Tagus *B* Heraus.

6 Indus: P^1 juons C^2 v nous; prochains: P^1C^2 plus p.; chaude: P^1C^2 haulte; *qui est* (P^1C^2): *the rest om.*

8 esclarcissent: BP^4 esclarciront *R* esclarciroit.

9 avugles: P^1 avuglent C^1DS avulles *B* a une cles; ci: P^1 *om.* P^4 si P^2 a.

10 esmeut: P^4 esmeuvent.

11 la: P^1C^2 *om.*

12 oscures trebuchances; *DS* obscurtes tenebres.

12-3 noter *et*: BP^4 *om.*

13 ceste: BP^4b celle: li rai: *B* li air.

PROSE XI.

1 certaines et: *b om.* BRC^1 (vraies) et cert.

2 par: *BDS* de; combien: P^1R c. dist elle.

3 cognoistre: *DS* entendre.

4 priseroie: BRP^2 pr. je; dis je: C^1b (*except* P^2) *om.*

5 ce: P^1C^2 *om.*; tres vraie: *b* certaine *R* vrai *B* uíue.

7 tant: C^1b *om.*; demourront: *R* demeurent.

10 chascuns uns: (C^1C^2RDS): P^1 ch. un *B* ch. en $P^3A^1A^2M$ un chascun P^2 chascuns.

13 noblece: *D* noble; et (joi.): P^1C^2 *om.*

17 qui (*a*): *b om.*

19 soient: $P^3A^1A^2M$ sont; faites: C^1DS *om.*

20 ce (*R*): *the rest* le; m'est: *B* met.

ce soit bien par la participacion de bien ou non?" "Je l'otroi", dis je. "Donques couvient il que tu ottroies que un et bien, par semblable raison, sont une meismes chose; car il couvient que, des chosez dont li faiz ne est pas naturelment divers, que la sustance en soit une meismes." "Ce ne puis je", dis je, "nier." "N'as tu pas donques cogneu", dist elle, "que tout ce qui est, tant longuement a il son estre et sa sustance, com longuement il est un, mais puis qu'il delaisse a estre un, il le couvient mourir et corrompre ensemble?" "En quel maniere?" dis je. "Si comme es bestes", dist elle, "quant l'ame et le corps sont conjoings en un et demeurent ensemble, ce est apelé beste; et quant leur unité est destruite par la dessevrance de l'un et de l'autre, lors apert que c'est chose morte et que ce n'est mais beste. Et li corps aussi, tant comme il demeure en une forme par conjonction de membres, il apert estre humaine figure; et se les parties du corps sont si devisees et desevrees l'une de l'autre que elles destruient unité, li corps delaisse a estre ce qu'il estoit avant. Et qui voudroit ainsi corre (*24ra*) par toutez ces autrez chosez, il verroit certainement que chascune chose est en sa sustance tandis comme elle est une et, quant elle laisse a estre une, elle *meurt ou* perist." "Quant je regarde", dis je, "pluseurs chosez, je n'y voy nulle chose autre."

"Est il donques riens", dist elle, "qui, en tant comme il vive naturelment, delaisse *le talent* et le desir de son estre et desire a venir a mort et a corruption?" "Se je regarde", dis je, "les bestes qui ont aucune nature de vouloir et de non vouloir, je n'en treuve nullez—se elles ne sont contraintez par dehors—qui getent *et despisent* l'entencion de estre *et de vivre* et se hastent de leur gré de venir a mort. Car chascune beste se travaille a deffendre le sauvement de sa vie et eschieve mort et destruiement. Mais je me doubte du tout et ne sai *que dire ne* quoi acorder des herbez et des arbrez et de toutez les chosez qui n'ont nulles ames."

"Certez aussi n'a il ci riens de quoy tu puisses doubter. Or regarde les herbez et les arbrez; ilz naissent premierement es lieus qui leur sont couvenablez, es quiex il ne peuent tost sechier ne mourir, tant comme leur nature les en puisse deffendre. Car les unes naissent es champs, les autres es montaignes, les autres es paluz, les autres se aherdent aus roichez, les autres craissent plenteureusement es sablons; et se aucuns s'esforce de porter les en autres lieus, elles y seichent. Mais nature donne a chascune ce que il li couvient et travaille a ce que elles ne muirent, tant comme elles ont pooir de vivre. Que diras tu de ce que elles treent toutez leur

---

21 (soit) bien: *b om.*; l'otroi: *DS* le croy.
22 il: P^1C^2S *om.*; couvient . . . tu: C^1 *om.*; et bien: P^1 est bon C^2 et bon.
23 sont (*a*; *B* sus *i.e. sunt*): *b* soient; faiz ($P^1C^1C^2DS$): RP^2 fes $P^3A^1A^2M$ effect; ne est: *BR* naist.
26 tant: P^3 si; a: *DS* dure a; il (*a*): *b om.*
27 mais . . . un: *BR om.*; qu'il: P^1C^2 que.
29 conjoings (-ntz, -ncts): C^1Rb (*except* P^3M) conjoint *B* adjoint.
30-1 et quant . . . beste: P^3 *om.*; l'un et: C^2 l'une et.
30 leur: *DS* ceste.
32 Et (li): *B* quar *R* car; tant: *D om.* *B* tost.
33-4 si devisees (P^4C^2RB): C^1 devisees *b* diverses.
34 li corps: *DS* et li c.
35 qu'il: P^1C^2 qui; avant (P^1C^2B): C par av. *Rb* devant; corre: C^1 contre.
37 sustance: *B* semblance; tandis (*a except* C^1; P^2): *the rest* tant.
39 chose: *B om.*
40 en tant: *B* entēt.
41 desir: *B* loisir.
43 et . . . vouloir: P^3 *om.*; elles: P^1 elle.
43-4 contraintez: BP^2DS contraires.
45 se: P^1C^2 *om.* *b* qui se; hastent: C^3 hastecent *DS* hastechent.
46 eschieve (P^1DS): P^2P^3M escheve BRA^1A^2 eschíue C^2 eschuie C^1 escuie.
47 du: P^1C^2 de; ne sai: P^2DS si ne sce; et des: P^1 ne des.
49 ci: P^1P^2 *om.*
50 naissent: P^1 *om.* C^2 sont; lieus: *B* biens.
52 en: P^1C^2 *om.*; deffendre: *B* delivrer et def.
52-3 les aut. es mont.: P^2DS *om.*
53 paluz: *b* p. et.
53-4 se ah. . . . autres: *B om.*
53 se aherdent (s'ah.): A^1 se herdent.
54 sablons: *D* samblans; s'esforce: $P^1C^1C^2P^2$ s'esforcent.
55 porter les: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted;* en: P^1C^2 *om.*
56 li: P^1C^2 *om.*; et trav. . . . muirent: *R om.*; ne: P^1C^2 ne y *B om.*
57 ont (*a*): *b* aient.

norrissement par leur racinez, aussi comme se elles eussent leurs bouchez plun- (*24rb*) giees dedens les terres, et espandent, par leur moeles, leur fust et leur escorce? Et que diras tu de ce qui est tres mol en eulz, si comme la moele? Elle est touz jours reposte ou siege plus dedens, et par dehors est deffendue par une forterece de fust, et l'escorce est contremise la derreniere encontre la destrempance du ciel, aussi comme deffendierrez puissans de malz souffrir. Mais certez or peuz tu ja veoir combien grant est en eulz la diligence de nature, car elles se renouvellent toutez par semence montepliee. Ne il n'est nus homme qui bien ne sache que elles sont toutez aussi comme uns fondemens et unes semences de durer non pas tant seulement par aucun temps, mais aussi comme de pardurablement durer par generacion. Et les chosez neis que on croit que n'aient nullez ames, ne desirent elles pas chascunes par semblable raison a garder ce qui est leur? Car pour quoy porte legiereté les flambes en hault et li faiz porte et appraint les terrez en bas, fors pour ce que cil lieus et ces mouvemens sont couvenablez a chascuns de eulz? Mais certez chascune chose garde ce que li est convenable et propre, si comme les chosez contrairez et anemies les corrompent. Et neis les chosez durez, si comme les pierrez, se aherdent tres tenablement a leurs parties et se deffendent en contrestant que l'une partie ne se departe legierement de l'autre. Et les chosez qui sont *moles et* decorans, si comme li airs et l'eaue, *se departent* legierement et donnent lieu a ceulz qui les devisent *et derompent,* mais il retournent tost de rechief es lieus dont il sont arrachiéz. Mais li feus fuit *et refuse* toute division. Ne nous ne traictons pas ores ici (*24va*) des volenterins mouvemens de l'ame cognoissant, mais de la naturelle entencion des chosez, si comme il avient que nous transgloutissons les viandez receues sens y penser et reprennons nos alaines en dormant et ne le savons pas lors; car certez neis es bestes l'amour *de leur vivre ne* de leur estre ne vient pas des volentéz de l'ame, mais des commencemens de nature. Car volenté, pour aucunes causez contraingnans, *desire et* embrasse mainte foiz la mort que nature redoubte *et hait.* Et veons aucune foiz le contraire: que volenté *hait ou destourbe et* refrene ce que nature desire *et requiert* touz jours, c'est assavoir l'euvre de generacion par laquelle chose seule *vit et* est soustenue par touz temps la loingtiengne durableté des chosez mortiex. Si que ceste charité *et ceste*

---

58 bouchez: P^1C^2 b. toutez.

59 plungiees . . . terres: P^1C^2 dedens les t. plung.; moeles (moueles): C^1 moulez P^1C^2 moele *DS* moulle.

60 fust (*a*): *b* force (*DS*: par leur moulle et par leur escorche leur forche).

61 et par: *B* et qui p.

63 deffendierrez: P^3 defenseur.

64 ja: *BRb om.*; combien (P^1C^2): C^1b con *BR* comme.

66 montepliee: P^3 multipliee; nus: P^1 *om.*

67 semences: P^1 sementez C^1 *om.* *Bb* (*except* P^2) (une) semence.

68 mais ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* mais neis; durer: P^1C^2 *om.*

69 croit: *BR* trait; que (P^1A^2DS): *B* que eles *the rest* qui.

70 semblable: P^1C^2S semblance.

71 legiereté (*DSa*; *R* legerete): *the rest* legeresce; flambes: *DS* coses *R* choses; faiz (fes): *R* flos.

71-2 et appraint: *BR om.*

72 cil (chil): *B* ce P^3A^1M ces A^2 ses; ces ($P^2P^3A^1M$): A^2a (*except* C^1) ses C^1DS chil (mouvement); sont: *B* soit.

73 que: *BRb* (*except* A^2M) qui.

74 anemies: P^3 advenues.

75 durez: P^2 *om.*

76 contrestant (*aDS*): $P^2P^3A^1A^2$ contraitant *M* contraictant.

77 se: P^1 *om.*; departe: *DS* departent.

79 tost: *B* tout.

80 arrachiéz (P^1C^2M): P^2 errachiez *B* enrachie RP^3A^1DS esrachie (-iez, -iet) A^2 estrachies C^1 parties et devisees; fuit *et refuse*: *B* f. et devise P^3 refuit.

81 traictons ($C^2P^3A^1A^2$): BRC^1P^2MS traitons P^1 trectons *D* trouvons; volenterins: P^3 voulentaires *DS* volentieux.

83 y: P^2DS *om.*

84 le savons: $P^1C^2P^2SM$ les s. A^2 les sentons.

85 l'amour: *b* ne vient pas l'amour; *de leur* . . . pas: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; *vivre*: *DS* usage; ne vient: P^2DS ne ne v.

87 mainte ($P^1C^2BP^2$): $C^1RP^3A^1A^2M$ maintes *D* maine *S* aucune.

88 *ou*: *Bb* et.

89 refrene: P^2 refreine *DS* refraine C^1 refresne *B* refraint.

90 seule: P^1C^2 *om.*; *vit*: *D* vient; temps: *D* tant *S* tant que.

91 loingtiengne (P^1C^2): *the rest* loingtaine (lointaigne, lontaine); Si que (*a*): *b* et pour ce.

91-2 charité . . . *amour*: *B* clarte et ceste amour et ceste charite.

amour que chascune chose a de soy meismes ne vient pas du mouvement de l'ame, mais de l'entencion de nature. Car la divine pourveance a donné aus chosez qui par lui sont criees ceste cause, et neis tres grant, *de vivre et* de durer—*c'est generacion*—pour ce que il desirent naturelment leur vivre et leur estre tant comme il en ont pooir. Par quoy tu ne pues en nulle maniere doubter que toutez les chosez qui sont ne requierent naturelment la ferme estableté de pardurablement manoir et de foir *mort et* destruction."

"Or recognois je donques", dis je, "que je voy ores *certainement,* sens doubter, les chosez qui me sembloient jadis estre doubteusez." "Mais", dist elle, "ce qui desire a estre et a pardurablement manoir, ce desire a estre un; car se un estoit destruit, certez estre ne remaindroit a nul." "C'est voir", (24*vb*) dis je. "Donques", dist elle, "desirent toutez chosez un." "A ce me sui je acordéz." "Mais nous avons monstré que celui meismes un est ce qui est bon." "Certez", dis je, "ainsi est il." "Toutez chosez donques", dist elle, "requierent bien; et cestui bien pues tu ainsi descrivre: biens est ce qui est desiré de touz." "Nulle chose", dis je, "plus vraie ne puet estre pourpensee. Car, ou toutez chosez sont raportees a niant et floteront sens gouverneur, despoilliees de un si comme de leur propre chief; ou s'il est riens a quoy toutez chosez tendent, ce sera de touz biens li souverains biens."

Lors dist elle: "O", dist elle, "li miens norriz, trop ai grant leesce de toy, car tu as fichié en ta pensee la cognoissance de commune verité. Mais en ce t'a il esté descouvert ce que tu disoies un pou ci devant que tu ne savoies pas." "Quelle chose?" dis je. "Qui est", dist elle, "la fins de toutez chosez. Car, certez, c'est la chose qui est desiree de touz et, pour ce que nous avons concueilli que ce est biens *qui est desiréz de touz,* il nous convient recognoistre que biens soit la fins de toutez chosez.

[METRE XI.]

Quiconques encerche verité par pensee parfonde et ne veult estre deceuz par nulles desvoiabletéz, *reflechisse et* retourt en soi meismes la clarté des yeulz de son cuer par dedens et restraingne en reflechissant entour son cuer les lons mouvemens de ses pensees, et enseigne a son courage a cognoistre que il tient repost en ses tresors tout quenque il quiert dehors. Lors li *aparra et* luira, plus clerement que li soleus ne luist, ce que la noire nue de l'erreur et du default de sa cognoissance avoit jadis couvert.

Car certez li corps, aportans la pesanteur (25*ra*) d'oubliance, n'a pas chaciee hors de vostre pensee toute la clarté de vostre cognoissance.

---

92 a: *B* est P^1C^2 *om.*; pas: P^1C^2 *om.*
94 par: *B* pour; criees (P^1BR): C^1C^2b crees; et neis: P^1C^2B est n.
95 pour ce: P^1C^2 *om.* C^1P^2 par ce.
95-6 desirent . . . pooir: C^1 vivent naturelment lor estre tant comme il poeent.
95 vivre: *BRb* vie (P^3 vi'e).
96 et leur estre: *B om.*; en (ont): $P^1P^2C^2A^2$ *om.*; Par (*a*): *b* pour.
99 je (voy): P^1C^2 *om.*
100 sembloient (*a except B*): *B* resembloient *b* (*except DS*) soloient *DS* sanlloyent.
102 se: P^1 ce: remaindroit (aP^2D): *the rest* demourroit.
104 acordéz: P^3 cosentu.
103-4 A ce . . . acordéz: *B om.*
106 descrivre: P^1C^2 destruire.
107 plus . . . puet: P^3 ne puet plus v. A^1A^2M n'est plus v. ne ne puet.
108 toutez . . . sens: A^2 *om.*; floteront (*a*): *b* flotent.
110 ce: P^1 et; de . . . biens: *DS* li souv. biens de tous b.
115 Quelle chose: *DS* quoy.
116 la: C^1 une *BRb* celle.
117 que ce: P^1 ce que P^3 ce qui C^1 qui ce.
118 recognoistre: P^1 cognoistre.

METRE XI.

1 encerche: P^3 enquiert; deceuz: P^4 decoups A^3 receupz.
2 *reflechisse*: BRP^4 flechisse A^3 *om.* retourt: *B* recourt A^3 recort P^3 retourne; des: P^1 de ces $C^2A^3P^4$ de ses.
3 reflechissant: P^1 flechissant; entour: P^1 en tout C^1C^2 entout.
4 enseigne: *D* ensengneche *S* enseigneche; a (son): *a* (*except R*) *b* (*except* A^1) en.
5 quiert ($P^1C^2A^3P^4$): *R* cuíert *B* requiert C^1 quíes *b* tient.
6 luira: P^1 li luira; ne luist: A^2 *om.*
6-7 que li . . . erreur: A^3 *om.*
6 la noire: P^1C^2 de la n.; nue: $P^3A^1A^2M$ nuit.
8 d'oubliance: *B* de obligence.

Certainement la semence de verité *se tient et* ahert dedens vostre courage et est esmeue *et esveilliee par le vent et* par les souffles de doctrine. Car pour quoy jugiéz vous de vostre gré les drois a ceulz qui les vous demandent? Certez ce ne feissiéz vous pas, se li norrissemens *et la force de raison* ne vesquist plungiee en la parfondece de vostre cuer. Et se la doctrine de Platon nous chante verité, tout quenque chascun aprent, il ne le fait fors que recorder, *si comme on recorde* les chosez oublieez."

[PROSE XII.]

Lors dis je: "Je m'acort forment a Platon, car tu me remembrez *et recordez* ja ces chosez la seconde foiz: premierement quant je en perdi la memoire par la troublant conjonction du corps avec l'ame, et puis quant je la perdi confonduz par le fais de ma douleur." Lors dist elle: "Se tu regardez les chosez premierement ottroiees, tu ne seras pas moult loing de recorder ce que tu deis jadis que tu ne savoies pas." "Quel chose?" dis je. "Par quiex gouvernaus", dist elle, "cist mondez est gouvernéz." "Bien en sui", dis je, "remembrans et recognui que je ne le savoie pas, mais ja soit ce que je voie ja de loing ce que tu proposez, toutevois le desire je a oir de toy plus plainement." "Tu ne cuidoies pas", dist elle, "un pou ci devant que on deust doubter que cist mondez ne fust gouvernéz par dieu." "Certez encores n'en doubte je pas," dis je, "ne jamés ne cuideré que on en doie douter et te espondré briefment par quiex raisons je sui meus a ce. Cist mondez (25*rb*) de tant et de si diversez et de si contrairez parties ne se fust onques assemblé en une forme, se un ne fust qui conjoingsist tant de chosez si diversez. Et la diversité meismes de leurs naturez qui se descorde l'une de l'autre despartiroit et desjoindroit les chosez conjointez, se un n'estoit qui contenist ce que il *a conjoint et* enlacié. Ne certez l'ordre de nature n'iroit pas si certaine ne ne despleroit si ordenéz mouvemens par lieus, par temps, par fesances, par espaces, par qualitéz, se un n'estoit qui fust parmanant et ordenast ces diversitéz de muances. Et celle chose, quelconques elle soit, par quoy toutez chosez sont faitez et sont meues, je la nomme dieu; ce est uns moz uséz a touz."

Lors dist elle: "Puis que tu sens ainsi ces chosez, je cuit que je ai pou a faire a ce que tu aiez beneurté et que tu revoies sains et haitiéz ton pais. Mais regardons les chosez que nous avons proposeez devant. N'avons nous pas nombré *et dit que* suffisance est en beneurté et avons acordé que diex est beneurtéz meismez?" "Oy, certez." "Et au monde gouverner", dist elle, "n'aura il onques mestier de nulles aides dehors; car autrement s'il avoit

---

10 ahert: P^2 aert *DS* art *R* haert.

11 est esmeue *et*: P^4 esmuet; souffles de: P^1C^2 *om.*; doctrine: P^1C^2 *pl.*

13 feissiéz ($C^1C^2RP^2DM$): *S* fesissies A^1 feissez A^2 fessies P^1 faissiez A^3P^4 faisies BP^3 fussiez; li norrissemens: *R* linou; *et*: *b* (*except* P^2) de.

15 le: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

15-6 fors que (*a*: *B* lors que): bA^3P^4 que.

1-2 *et recordez*: *b om.*

2 en *or* em (*a*): *b om.*

3 troublant: P^1C^2 *om.* *D* tramblant.

5 ottroiees: *a* (*except B*) *DS* ottroies (ottrijes).

7 gouvernaus (P^1C^2): C^1Rb gouvernemens *B* gouvernement.

8 recognui: C^1R reconnui C^2 recōgnu *B* recogneu *b* reconnois.

9 je voie: P^1C^2 tu voies.

10 cuidoies: *R* cuides; dist elle: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*

12 dis je: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*; cuideré (-rai, -ray): *B* cuideroie *R* douteroie C^2 douterai.

13 espondré ($P^1C^2A^1$): RP^2 espondrai C^1DS esponderai A^2M respondre *B* respondrai P^3 exposeray; meus (*BR*): *the rest* venus.

14 de si (contr.): *b om.*

15 conjoingsist (-joinsist): P^3M conjoignist BC^1 conjoint C^2 conjoing.

18 *a conjoint et* enlacie: P^1 conjoinst et enlace P^2 conjoint et enlacie.

18-9 de . . . certaine ne: *B om.*

19 despleroit (P^1C^2): *B* desplairoit C^1Rb desploieroit.

22 sont (meues): *b om.*; meues: *S* menees *D* mellees.

22-3 je la nomme: P^1 ja la renommee.

23 uséz a: P^3 commun nomme de.

24 je ai: *D* jaye *M* je aye C^1 j'aie.

25-7 que tu revoies . . . beneurté et: *B om.*

26 nous (pas): $P^1C^2A^1$ *om.*

27 est: P^1 et; en: $P^1C^2P^3A^1$ *om.*

28 dist elle: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*

29 onques: *b om.*; mestier: P^2DS nul m.; nulles aides: C^1 nulle aide P^1C^2 nulle chose.

besoing de aide, il n'auroit pas plaine suffisance." "Ainsi couvient il", dis je, "que ce soit." "Donques ordenne il par soy seul toutez chosez." "Ce ne puet estre nié", dis je. "Mais nous avons monstré que diex est biens meismes." "Bien m'en remembre", dis je. "Par bien donques ordene il toutez chosez, se cil les gouverne toutez par soi—que nous avons acordé qu'il est biens; et cist est aussi comme uns clos et uns gouvernaus par quoy la faiture (25*va*) de cest monde est gardee estable et sans corrompre." "Forment", dis je, "m'y acort; et aperçui un pou ci devant, ja soit ce que ce fust par petite soupeçon, que ce vousissez tu dire." "Je le croi", dist elle, "car si comme je cuit, tu ameines ja plus ententivement tes yex a regarder les vrais biens. Mais ce que je te dirai n'apert pas moins a regarder." "Quel chose?" dis je. "Comme on croie", dist elle, "et par droit, que diex gouverne toutez chosez par le clo et par le gouvernail de sa bonté et ces meismes chosez toutez, si comme je t'ai ensegnié, se hastent par naturel entencion de venir a bien, nulz ne puet doubter que elles ne soient gouvernees volenterinez et qu'elles ne se convertissent de leur gré a la volenté de leur ordeneur, aussi comme acordans et enclinans a leur roy."

"Ainsi le couvient il", dis je; "ne li royaumes ne sembleroit pas estre beneuréz, se les choses acouplees au jou se traioient en diversez partiez; li sauvemens des chosez descordans n'y seroit pas." "Donques n'est il riens qui nature garde qui puisse aler contre dieu." "Non", dis je. "Et se riens", dist elle, "s'i esforçoit, pourroit il a la parfin profiter encontre celui que nous avons ottroié par le droit de beneurté a estre tres puissant?" "Certez", dis je, "du tout ce ne li vaudroit riens." "Donques n'est il nulle chose qui a cestui souverain bien puisse ou vueille contraistier." "Je ne le cuide pas", dis je. "Donques", dist elle, "est ce li souverains biens qui toutez chosez gouverne forment et les ordene soevement."

Lors dis je: "Combien", dis je, "me delite non pas tant seulement *la fin ou* la somme des raisons que tu as concluse *et prouvee*, (25*vb*) mais certez moult plus me delitent ycelles meismes parolez que tu me deis; si que, a la parfin, *et je et* li *autre* fol *mesdisant* qui les grans chosez despiecent aucune foiz *et mesdient* en devons avoir grant honte de nous meismes, *si comme je avoie dit devant que diex refuse seulement les faiz des hommes et que il ne s'en entremet.*" "Tu as bien oy", dist elle, "es fablez des poetes que li geant assaillirent le ciel *o les diex;* mais la debonnaire force *de dieu* les

---

30 besoing (*a*): *b* bes. ou mestier; de aide: *b* *om.*

35 qu'il (*editor's correction for* qui): *B* quest A^2S que est; clos (aP^2): P^3A^1M clou A^2 cleu *DS* claus; uns (*according to* C^1C^2-BRP^2DS): P^1 un; gouvernaus ($P^1C^1C^2P^2$): $P^3A^1A^2M$ gouvernail *BR* gouvernemens.

37 aperçui (P^1BRP^2): C^1 aperchuc *S* apperchuch C^2 aperczoi *D* aperchoi $P^3A^1A^2M$ aperceu.

38 le croi: P^1C^2 l'ottroi.

39 ja: P^1C^2 *om.*; ententivement (C^1BR; *b except* P^2S): *S* ententieument P^2 ententiment P^1C^2 enterinement; tes yex (*BR*; *b except* A^2): A^2 ces y. C^1 tels gens P^1C^2 telz.

40 dirai: BRC^1b d. ja.

42 clo: *B* col P^3A^1 clou A^2M cleu *DS* clau; gouvernail: C^1C^2 gouvernal *B* gouvernement.

43 si . . . ensegnié: P^1C^2 *om.*

44 que elles: $P^1C^1C^2$ que il.

45 volenterinez: P^3 volentairement; qu'elles: P^1 quel.

46 et enclinans: *R* et encrinans.

48 choses: P^1C^2 *om.*; acouplees au jou: P^2 acomplies au j. *B* acompliees au jour *D* acomplees au jeu C^1 accouplees a un (*i.e.* ieu); traioient: P^3 trahioient P^1C^2B traient.

49 sauvemens: *R* souverains; seroit: A^1D seront P^3 seroient.

50 garde (P^1C^2): *the rest* gart (C^1M gard).

51 s'i esforçoit: P^1 sil c'esf. P^3 se esf.; profiter: *B* port'.

54 puisse ou vueille: BRP^2DS *inverted.*

55 dist elle: C^1 *om.* P^1C^2 dist.

56 forment: $P^3A^1A^2M$ fortement: soevement: C^1b souefment *B* soigneusement.

57 Combien dis: *B* *om.*

58 concluse *et prouvee*: C^1C^2BDS *pl.*

59 deis ($P^1C^2A^1$): *the rest* dis (P^3M diz); a: P^2DS en.

60 despiecent (P^1P^2): C^2 depiecent *DS* depiechent C^1 depechent BRA^1A^2M despisent P^3 desprisent.

61 *mesdient*: *B* en m.; honte: *B* dueil.

62 *les faiz des hommes*: P^3 la fin ou la sommes (*sic*).

63 *en*: $P^2DSP^3A^1$ *om.*; dist elle: C^1b (*except* P^2) *om.*; es (aP^2S; *D* as): $P^3A^1A^2M$ les; fablez: P^1 flabez.

64 geant: A^2 grans P^3 geyans; assaillirent: P^3 assaillent: *o* (ou) *les diex*: *R* ou les d. estoient $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

ordena *et les destruist, si comme elle dut et* si comme il fu chose digne. Mais veulz tu que nous joingnons ensemble ces meismes raisons? Par aventure de ceste conjonction saudra aucune bele estencele de verité." "Fai", dis je, "si comme tu voudras." "Que diex", dist elle, "ne soit touz puissans, nulz homs n'en est en doubte." "Certez", dis je, "nul n'en doubte, s'il n'est hors de son sans." "Mais cil", dist elle, "qui est touz puissans, il n'est nulle chose que il ne puisse." "C'est voir", dis je, "nulle riens n'est que il ne puisse." "Puet donques diex faire mal?" "Non", dis je. "Donques", dist elle, "est mal niant, comme cil ne le puisse faire qui ne puet pas faire niant (*puis que mal et ce que diex ne puet faire sont pareil*).

"Me moques tu", dis je, "ou tu te jeuez *ou tu me deçois* qui ci m'as tissue par tes raisons la maison Dedalus si entrelaciee que on ne la scet desclacier, qui aucune foiz t'i entres par la ou tu t'en is, aucune foiz t'en is par la ou tu y entrez, ne me ploies tu pas ensemble *par replicacion de parolez une pelote ou* une rondece de la divine simplicité? Car certez, quant tu un pou devant commençoiez de la beneurté, tu disoies que elle estoit li (26*ra*) souverains biens et disoies que elle est assise ou souverain dieu. Et disoies que diex meismes est souverains biens et que il est plaine beneurtéz dont tu me donnoiez aussi comme un coronable don: c'est que nulz n'est beneuréz se il n'est diex avec. Et disoies de rechief que la forme meismes de bien est la sustance de dieu et de beneurté; et disoies que celle meismes chose une est cil meismes biens qui est *requis et* desiréz de toute la nature des chosez. Et prouvoiez en desputant que diex gouverne toutez les chosez du monde par les gouvernaus de bonté et que toutez chosez li veulent obeir et que la nature de mal n'est pas aucune chose. Et ces chosez monstroiez tu nommie par raisons prisez dehors, mais par preuvez *et par argumens* enlaciéz et cogneuz dont chascuns de eulz treait a soi sa foy *et son acort* li uns de l'autre."

Lors dist elle: "Nous *ne te moquons pas ne* ne jouons *ne ne te decevons*, ainçois t'avons monstré la chose qui est tres grant sur toutez chosez par le don de dieu que nous depriasmes jadis. Car ce est la forme de la divine sustance qui est telle que elle ne se escolorge pas es chosez estrangez ne ne reçoit nulle chose estrange en soy, mais si comme dit Parmenides de celle divine sustance: "Elle tournoie *le monde et* la rondece mouvable des chosez, endementiers que elle se garde sans soy mouvoir." Mais se nous avons demené raisons non mie prisez dehors l'avironnement de la chose que nous trections, mais misez dedens, il n'i a riens pour quoy tu te doies merveillier,

---

65 *elle . . .* comme: *B om.*
67 bele: P^1 beste.
68 Fai: P^1 se.
68-9 Que . . . puissans: *B* cuides tu, dist elle, que diex ne soit tout puissant.
70 de son: $P^3A^1A^2M$ du: Mais: P^2DS *om.*
72 faire: *B* estre; Non: *BR* nenil voir.
73 puet: P^2DS puet pas *R* p. mie.
74 *faire*: A^1A^2M *om.*; *sont*: P^1B son.
75 *moques tu*: A^2 molz es tu; tu te jeuez (*a except* C^1; P^3S): C^1 tu jues $P^3A^1A^2M$ te joues (joes) tu *D* te te j.; *ou* (tu me): $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; *tu* (me): *D* te; ci: *BRb* (*except* P^3S) si P^3 *om.*; tissue (*a*): *b* tissu (*M* tixu).
76 Dedalus: *R* Dedelus; si (*a*): *D* est si *S* est ainsi P^2P^3 qui est si A^1A^2M qui est ci.
77 t'i (*B*): C^1 tu *the rest* t'en; (entres) par la . . . en (is par): *R om.*: tu t'en is: *DS* tu en is P^2A^1M t'en is; aucune foiz t'en is: *B om.*
78 ploies: *R* plaiet.
79 simplicité: *B* supplicite.
80-1 estoit . . . elle: $P^3A^1A^2MS$ *om.*; *D inserts after* disoies *a sentence repeated further on, ll.* 87-9, les chosez . . . ces chosez).
83 coronable: *B* couvenable.
84 se il n'est: $P^3A^1A^2M$ qui ne soit; Et disoies de r. (*according to* C^1): P^1C^2B de r. et dis. *Rb* de r. tu d.; meismes: *B om.*
86 toute la nature: *B pl.*
87 prouvoiez: *B* prouuai.
88 gouvernaus (C^1): P^1C^2 -nans *BRb* gouvernemens.
89 mal: *B* maïs; chosez: P^1C^2 meismes ch.
91 treait (P^1C^2): P^2DS traioit A^1A^2 trahoit P^3 trahioit *M* traihoit BRC^1 trait.
93 *pas*: *R* mie *b om.*
96 es: BRC^1 en *b* as (aus, aux).
97 estrange en soy: P^1C^2 *inverted.*
98 Elle tournoie (P^1BR): C^2 e. tournaie C^1 e. tournie *b* cele tourne.
99 avons: P^1 *om.*
100 que: $P^3A^1A^2M$ dont.
101 trections (P^1C^2): *the rest* traitons (traictons); te: P^1 *om.*

comme tu aies apris par la sentence de Platon qu'il (26*rb*) couvient que les paroles soient cousinez aus chosez dont il parlent."

[METRE XII.]

Beneuréz est li homs qui pot regarder la clere fontaine de bien; beneuréz est qui se pot deslier de liens de la terre pesant. Orpheus qui gemi jadis *et ot moult grant dueil de* la mort de sa fame, puis que il ot fait par ses plourablez chançons les bois mouvablez et courre apres lui, et ot fait les fleuvez arrester, et ot fait que les cers *et les bichez* joindrent sens paour aus crueus lions leurs costez *pour oir son chant*, et ot fait que li lievrez n'out pas paour du chien qui par la chançon s'estoit apaiséz—comme la plus ardant amour *de sa fame* li ardist les entrailles de son piz ne les chançons qui avoient vaincu toutez chosez ne peussent pas asoagier leur seigneur—il se complaint des diex que il li estoient cruex; il s'en ala aus hostiex d'enfer. Illeques atrempa il ses douces chançons par cordez resonnans, et *dist et* chanta en pleurant tout quenque il avoit *apris et* puisié es nobles fontaines de sa mere *Calliope* la deesse, et chanta de tout quenque puissance de pleur et de tout quanque amour qui doubloit le pleur li donnoit *et enseignoit;* et esmut enfer et requist par douce priere les diex d'anfer, seigneurs des ames, que il li rendissent sa fame. *Cerberus*, li portiers d'enfer ou toutez ses tres testes, fu touz esbahiz pour la nouvelle chançon; les trois deesses vencherressez des felonniez qui *tourmentent et* espoentent les ames nuisans devindrent lors tristez (26*va*) *et dolentez* et pleurerent *de pitié*. Lors ne fu pas tourmentee la teste Ixion par l'isnele roe et Tantalus qui estoit destruiz par *rage de* longue soif despist les fleuvez *et n'a cure de boire*. Li voultoers qui menjue le gisier Titius est du chant si saoulz que il *n'en veult plus mengier ne* ne le tire plus. A la parfin Pluto, *sires et* juges des ames, fu esmeus a misericorde et cria: "Nous sommes vaincuz. Nous donnons a Orpheus sa fame pour li faire compaignie, il l'a bien achetee par biau chanter. Mais nous metrons lai *et couvenances* au don, *c'est a savoir* que, quant il sera hors d'enfer, s'il regarde puis derrierez soy, elle revendra a

---

103 cousinez: P^1 consuiez *B* consuuies.

1 li homs: P^3 celui; pot (P^1R): C^2 peut C^1S poet *the rest* puet (*M* peuet).

2 pot (P^1C^2R): C^1S poet *M* peuet *the rest* puet; de liens: *Bb* *om.*; pesant: *R* pessant BA^3P^4 puissant; gemi ($P^1C^1C^2A^1A^2$; P^3 gemy): P^2DS gemist *M* gemit A^3 je viz P^4 je vy *BR* je vi.

4 et (courre): bP^4 *om.*; et courre: A^3 *om.*

4-5 les fl. . . . fait: P^4 *om.*

5 *bichez*: C^1DS bisses; joindrent: joignirent *M* joindre (C^1: ot fait joindre; *text changed in* A^3).

7 s'estoit: P^1 c'e.; apaisiéz: P^4 appaies; comme: BRP^4 si comme.

9 toutez: *b* t. ces; leur: *B* son.

10 que il: $C^1C^2DSP^4$ qui.

11 douces: A^3P^4BR doulereuses; resonnans: P^1 raisonnans BP^4 ressonans.

14 le: P^1 de.

15 esmut (*a except B*; P^2DS): $P^3A^1A^2M$ esmeut P^4 s'en entre en A^3 s'en entra en (*B*: enseignoit en son cuer en enfer seigneur des ames . . .); requist (*according to* C^1): *the rest* requiert.

16 rendissent ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* rendent (A^3: qui rendirent); ou (P^1C^2): *BR* o C^1 od bP^4 a; ses: P^4M ces.

17 testes: P^1 bestes: pour: P^4 par C^1 de.

18 vencherressez (P^1P^2): C^2b (*except* P^2) vengeresses A^3P^4BR venderesses C^1 vanteresses.

19 pleurerent: *B* plouroient P^4 esplourees.

20 la teste: P^1 la beste *b* *om.*; Ixion: *D* yzien *S* Yzion.

21 *rage de*: P^3A^3 *om.* (*several lacunae in* A^3); soif: P^4 souef; despist: BP^4P^2DS despit *R* desput P^3 desprise; *et n'a cure*: *D* et nature A^3P^4B par nature; Li: P^1C^2 et le; voultoers: C^1 voltoers *R* voultouers C^2 voultoiers P^3 voultouer A^1A^2M voutouer P^2S voutoirs P^4 voltoirs *D* voutours A^3 vaultors *B* voltõniers.

22 menjue . . . Titius: P^3 *om.*; menjue (P^1; C^2 ne menjue que): $A^3P^4BRA^2DS$ mengue P^2 mangue A^1 manjue C^1M maine; le gisier (gesier): P^1 que ligier C^2 que legier C^1DS le jusier *B* le juisier A^3 les iugiers P^4 les visiers; est: P^1 et; *n'en*: P^1C^2M ne; *veult plus*: P^1C^2 v. pas plus.

22-3 que . . . *mengier*: P^3 ne menjue.

23 tire plus: P^3 t. p. le cuer Ticius; *sires*: $A^1A^2A^3M$ seigneur P^3 arbitre.

24 a (miser.): P^1 en P^4B es (misericordes) A^3 et P^3 de (A^3: et misericors s'escria); donnons: *D* deuons *B* devons rendre.

25 li faire: P^1B *inverted* (*B*: f. la); par biau (*BR*): P^4 par beau C^2 par bleau C^1 per bien *b* pour bien (A^3: pour lui faire sa compagnie il la bien achete mectons loy).

26 que: *b* *om.*

27 puis: A^3P^4BDS plus P^3 apres; derrierez: $A^3P^4BRP^3$ derriere C^1 derier C^2 darreire P^2 arriers A^1A^2MDS arriere.

nous." Mais qui est cil qui puisse donner lai aus gens amoureus? Amours est a soi meismes lai plus grant *et plus fort que nulle loi que on li puisse donner*. Halas! quant il furent pres du terme de la nuit, Orpheus regarda Erudice sa fame et la perdi et fu morte.

Ceste fable apartient a vous touz quiconques couvoitiés metre vostre pensee en la tres grant clarté du souverain bien. Car qui sera si vaincuz que il fichera les yeulx en la fosse d'enfer, *c'est a dire, qui metra sa pensee es chosez terriennes,* trestout quenque il trait de noble bien celestial, il le pert quant il regarde aus bassez chosez de la terre."

[BOOK IV]

[PROSE I.]

Comme Philosophie eust chanté soevement et delitablement les chosez dessus ditez en gardant la dignité de son voult et (26*vb*) la pesanteur de ses paroles, lors je, qui n'avoie pas du tout oublié *le pleur et* le dueil qui estoit assis en mon cuer, li entrerompi s'entencion de ce que elle vouloit encores dire aucune chose oultre. "O", dis je, "tu qui es *lanterne et* conduiserresse de vraie clarté, les chosez que tu m'as dittes jusques ci me sont *si cleres et* si apparans, et par leur devin regart et par tes raisons *par quoy tu les a prouvees,* que elles ne peuent estre vaincuez; et les chosez que tu m'as dites, ja soit ce que je les eusse novellement oubliees pour la douleur du tort que on m'a fait, toutevois ne m'estoient elles pas du tout mescogneues avant. Mais ceste chose neis est la tres grant cause de ma douleur que, come le gouverneur de chosez soit bons, savoir mon, se mal peuent estre du tout ou se il trespassent sens estre punis; la quelle seule chose, combien qu'elle soit digne de grant merveille, tu meismes certez le regardez *et le ses bien*. Mais a ceste seule chose est encorez ajointe une plus grant. Car *je voi que* felonnie est empereriz et fleurist *plaine de richeces et des autres prosperitéz,* et vertuz n'est pas tant seulement sans loiers *et sens meritez,* mais est neis defoulee et mise souz les piéz des felons hommes et compere *et pleure* les tourmens que li mauvaiz et li felon deussent comparer et pleurer. Des quiex chosez toutez nulz homs ne se puet asséz merveillier ne complaindre, comme elles sont faitez ou royaume de dieu qui toutez chosez scet et toutez chosez puet et ne veult tant seulement fors que bonnes chosez." (27*ra*).

Lors dist elle: "Certes, voirement seroit ce *grant merveille et* esbahisse-

---

28 gens: $P^3A^1A^2MP^4$ *om.* (*several lacunae in* A^3).

29 a (soi): P^1 en; meismes: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; lai . . . *fort*: *b* plus grant loy; *nulle loi que*: *bR om.* BP^4 loi nulle que; *li puisse* (P^1C^2B): *R* ne li p. *b* ne puisse C^1 peuíst.

30 regarda: P^1 regarde.

32 fable: P^1 faible; vous: P^1 nous; couvoitiés: P^1 cognoitrait C^2 cognoistrez A^3P^4 couvoiteux; metre: *b* a m.

34 les: P^1 ses.

35 *terriennes*: *R* terrenes *B* certaines; trestout: P^1C^2 tretout P^4 tout P^3 *om.*

BOOK IV

1 soevement (souev.): C^1b souefment (P^3 souefvement).

2 la (dig.): P^1C^2 *om.*; dignité: *BR* divinite; pesanteur: *B* p'sumpteur.

3 n'avoie . . . tout: *b* du (P^2 de) tout n'av. pas *B* n'av. pas.

4 entrerompi: *B* autres rompi; s'entencion: *B* sanz auxion.

5 *lanterne*: P^1 lantreure; conduiserresse: *B* conduiseur.

6 de: P^1C^2 *om.*; clarté: *DS* lumiere P^2 *om.* (P^2: de vraies coses).

11 Mais . . . douleur: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

12 le gouverneur: RP^2DS li gouvernerres; mal: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ maux (maulx).

14 certez: BRC^1 *om.*; regardez (*according to* BP^2DS): *the rest* gardes; *le* (ses): P^1C^2D les C^1 *om.*

15 ajointe (*a*): *b* a ajouster; une (P^1C^2): *the rest* une autre.

16 empereriz: C^1 empeeris A^1 emperris P^3A^3 emperiere.

16-7 *des aut. prosp.* et: *B om.*

18 est neis: *b inverted* C^1 est.

19-20 et pleurer: *B om.* P^1 pleurez.

20 asséz: P^1 *om.*

21 comme (P^1C^2): *the rest* comment.

24 Lors dist elle: C^1 *om.*; Certes: P^1C^2 *om.*; ce: P^1 se.

ment sans fin et monstrez plus horriblez que touz autrez, s'il estoit si comme tu cuidez, c'est a savoir que en la tres ordenee maison de si grant pere *et de si grant ordeneur* de mesnie, li vaissel vil *et ort* estoient aourné et li precieus y fussent ort *et vil*. Mais il n'est pas ainsi. Que se les chosez que nous avons conclusez un pou ci devant remaingnent enterines *et vraies*, tu cognoistras par l'aide de dieu de cui royaume nous parlons que li bon y sont certez touz jours puissans et li mauvais y sont touz jours *vilz et* degitéz et foiblez, ne li vice ne sont onques sens paine ne les vertuz ne sont mie sens loier, et que les beneurtéz aviennent touz jours aus bons et les maleurtéz touz jours aus mauvais; et cognoistras moult de chosez de ceste maniere qui te feront tes complaintez endormir et te renforceront par ferme forteresce. Et pour ce que tu as veue la forme de vraie beneurté par moy qui la t'ai monstree jadis et as cogneu en quoy elle est assise, toutez les chosez traiteez les quiex je cuit que laissier les conviengne, je te monstrerai la voie qui te ramenra a ton hostel. Je te ficherai neis pennes en ta pensee par quoy elle se pourra eslever en hault, si que, toute tribulacion ostee, tu, par mon conduit et par ma sentelle et par mes veicturez, retourneras sains et haitiéz a ton paiz.

[METRE I.]

Je ai isnelez pennes seurmontans les haulteces du ciel. Quant la pensee isnele s'en est vestue, elle despit les terrez haineuses, elle seurmonte la rondece (27*rb*) du grant air et voit les nues emprés son dos et trespasse la haultesse de la region du feu qui s'eschaufe par l'isnel mouvement du firmament, jusques a tant que elle se lieve es maisons des planetez et aille avec le solail, ou face compaignie en sa voie a *Saturnus,* le froit veillart, et chevauche avec sa clere estoille, ou queure par le cercle des estoilles en touz les lieus ou la nuit resplendissant en est painte. Et puis que elle aura ja asséz alé, elle delaissera le derrenier point du ciel et marchera seur le dos du firmament isnel et verra la redoubtable clarté.

Illecques tient li sires des roys le sceptre *de sa puissance* et atrempe le gouvernement du monde et gouverne illec, li resplendissant jugez des chosez qui est establez en soi, le cours isnel *de cest siecle*. Et se ta voie te raporte si que tu soies la ramenéz, *tu diras lors que c'est li pais que tu requiers ores* dont il ne te souvient maintenant. Et diras: "Je m'en remembre bien, c'est

25 monstrez plus horriblez: B moult tres plus ottroiables (*sic*); que touz: P^2 de tous (*marginal*) BRC^1D que toutes; si (a): b ainsi.
27 de mesnie (P^2): C^1DS de maisnie P^1 des mesnie C^2 des mesgnies R de menee B demaine $P^3A^1A^2M$ de famille; li vaissel vil *et ort* (BC^1P^2DS): P^1C^2 li v. vilz et ors $P^3A^1A^2M$ les vaisseaulx vilz et ors.
28 Que (P^1C^2): *the rest* car.
29 enterines (a): b entieres.
30-1 y sont certez (a): P^2DSA^3 cert. y sont P^3A^1M sont.
30 li bon ($C^1RP^2DSA^2$): P^1 li bons *the rest* les bons.
31 puissans . . . jours: A^2 *om.*; (mauv.) y sont (aD; S il sont): $P^2P^3A^1M$ certes i (P^3 ilz) sont.
32 ne sont (onques) ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* ni (ny) s.; onques: P^3 jamaiz; ne sont (mie) (P^1C^2): *the rest* ni s.
33 loier: B joie; aviennent ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* viennent.
36 forteresce: P^1 fortraice.
39 la voie: P^2 *om.*; ramenra (BP^3MD; C^1 re-): $R^1A^2A^3$ ramerra P^1C^2 metra P^2 remetra; en (ta): C^1C^2b (*except* DS) a.
41 mon: P^1C^2 *om.*; veicturez (veit-, voit-): M vestures A^2B vesteures.
42 a ($P^1C^2A^2$): *the rest* en.

METRE I.

1 pennes: P^1 paines C^2 peines; seurmontans: P^1 seurmontemans; les haulteces: P^4 *sing.*
2 isnele: B du ciel.
3-4 et voit . . . feu: R *om.*
3 et (voit): A^3P^4B elle; emprés: b apres.
7 queure ($P^1RA^1A^2$): C^2 cueure C^1 keuure B coure M queurt S courir P^3D quiere.
8 ou la: A^3P^4 en la R ouilla; en est painte: P^3 est empaincte A^2 en est enpainte.
10 dos: P^4 doulz B (les) des.
11 sires: P^2DS roys.
12 le (gouv.): P^1 li.
13 est establez: A^3P^4B sont gouvernees; le: P^1 li.
13-4 Et se . . . ramenéz: A^3 *om.*
13 se: P^1C^2 *om.*; ta voie: P^4 tu avoies; te P^1 ta.
15 souvient: P^4B souvenoit A^3 *om.*; m'en: Bb me.

ci li miens pais; ici fus je nez, ici feniré je ma voie *et ci demorré.* "Mais s'il te plaist lors a regarder la tenebreuse occurté des terrez que tu as laissiee, tu verras *les orgueilleus roys et* les felons tyrans que li chetif peuple craingnent orendroit qui seront essilliéz hors de ce biau pais."

[PROSE II.]

Lors dis je: "*Trop me merveil et* sui tous eshabiz de ce que tu me proméz si grans choses. Ne je ne doubte pas que tu ne puissez bien faire ce que tu proméz, mais je te pri tant seulement que tu ne tardez pas a dire ces chosez a moy que tu as esmeu a entendre." "Premierement", dist elle, "couviendra que tu cognoissez que (27*va*) li bon sont touz jours fors et puissans et li mauvais *foiblez et* desnuéz de toutez forces; et de ceulz, certez, est demonstréz li uns par l'autre. Car comme bien et mal soient contraire, se nous sommez certain que bien soit puissant, la foiblece du mal nous est toute aparant; et se nous cognoissons la foiblece du mal, la force du bien nous est cogneue. Mais pour ce que la creance de nostre sentence soit *plus grant et* plus habondant, je m'en iré par l'une et par l'autre voie et confermeré or deça or dela les chosez propousees.

Deus chosez sont par quoy l'euvre de touz les faiz humains est parfaite, c'est a savoir vouloir et pooir et, se li un de ces deus fault, n'est riens qui puisse estre fait. Car se volenté fault, nulz n'enprent a faire ce que il ne veult pas; et se puissance fault, volenté est pour niant. Dont il avient que, se tu vois aucun qui vueille aconsuivre ce que il n'aconsuit pas, tu ne pues doubter que puissance *de avoir et* de tenir ce que il veult ne li faille." "Ce est cler", dis je, "ne ce ne puet estre nié en nulle maniere." "Et se tu vois que aucuns ait fait ce que il voult, doubteras tu que il n'en ait eu le pooir?" "Non." "Mais en ce que chascuns peut, en ce le doit on tenir a puissant; et en ce que il ne peut, le doit on tenir a foible." "Je le recognois", dis je. "Te souvient il ores donques", dist elle, "que nous avons cueilli *et monstré* par les raisons dessus ditez que toute l'entencion de l'umaine volenté qui est menee par diversez estudez se haste de venir a beneurté?" "Je m'en remembre (27*vb*) bien", dis je, "et que ce a ja esté demonstré." "Et ne recordez tu donques que beneurtéz est cil biens meismes *que on requiert,* si que, quant beneurtéz est requise de touz, aussi est biens desiréz de touz?" "Ce ne recorde je pas", dis je, "car ce tien je touz jors fichié en ma memoire."

"Tuit homme donques, bon et mauvais ensemble, s'esforcent sans difference a parvenir a bien." "Ceste consequence", dis je, "est vraie." "Mais certaine chose est que par la consuiance de bien sont fait li homme bon."

---

16 ci (P^1R): *the rest om.*; fus . . . ici: A^3P^4 *om.*; fus: P^1 fu B sui; voie: bA^3P^4B vie; *demorré* (demourrai): C^1 demeure.

17 lors: *placed after* verras *l.* 18, *in* A^3P^4B.

19 orendroit (ore endroit): P^1C^2 contre droit; seront (C^1 serront): P^1 seroit; hors: A^3 *om.*; biau (BRP^2): P^1 biaus C^1b (*except* P^2) bel (biel) A^3P^4 beau C^1 bleau.

PROSE II.

1 tous (tout): P^1C^2 trop.

2 grans choses: P^1 *sing.;* doubte: B cuide: pas: P^1 *om.* R mie; puissez: P^1 me p.

2-3 que tu . . . mais: A^2 *om.*

3-5 tu ne . . . que tu (cog.): C^1 *om.*

4 a moy: DS *om.*

5 couviendra: B convendra R commandera; li bon (*editor's correction according to* C^1RP^2-DS): P^1 li bons.

8 bien: P^2DS li b.; soit: B est; nous (est): b *om.*

12 or deça or dela (*a*): b (*except* DS) or ca or la DS o cha o la.

14 vouloir et pooir: C^2 volair ou poair P^1 vouloir ou p. $P^3A^1A^2M$ p. et v.; de ces: P^2DS des.

15 n'enprent: $P^1C^2BA^2$ ne prent S ne est prent.

16 se: P^1C^2 *om.*

17 aconsuivre: P^1C^2 consuivre.

19 cler dis je: B diex.

20 n'en ait eu: P^1C^2 ne ait.

21 en ce le: P^1C^2 *om.*

22 puissant . . . tenir a: P^3A^2 *om.*; recognois: $C^1P^3A^1$ cougnoiz A^2M te cognois S confesse.

23 ores: D *om.*; ores . . . elle: B *om.*

25 diversez (P^1): *the rest* divers (C^1DS diviers).

26 Je m'en: A^1A^2M je me R je B il me; remembre: C^1DS ramembre BRP^3 membre; dis je, "et: B *om.*

31 ensemble: B *om.*

33 que: P^1C^2 *om.*; consuiance: S consievance

“C'est certain.” “Donques aconsuient li bon ce que il requierent?” “Ainsi le m'est il avis.” “Mais li mauvais, s'il aconsuiaient le bien que il desirent, il ne pourroient estre mauvais.” “Ainsi est.” “Comme li un et li autre donques desirent bien, mais li bon l'aconsuient et li mauvais non, ce n'est pas donques doubte que li bon ne soient puissant et li malvais foible et non puissant?” “Quiconques”, dis je, “doubte de ce, il ne puet *cognoistre ne* veoir la nature des chosez ne la consequence des raisons.”

“De rechief”, dist elle, “se deus sont qui selonc nature aient un meisme propons et li un de ceulz le hante et le parfaice par naturel office et li autre ne puisse faire cel office naturel, mais acomplice son propons par autre maniere qui n'est pas couvenable a nature et s'esforce *a resembler et* a ensuivre celui qui naturelment l'acomplist, le quel de ces deus tiens tu a plus puissant?” “Et se je aparçoif”, dis je, “si comme je cuit, ce que tu veulz dire, toutevois le desire je a oir de toy plus plainement.” “Tu ne nieras pas”, dist elle, “que li mou- (28*ra*) vement de aler ne soit donné aus hommez selonc nature?” “Certez non”, dis je. “Et si ne doubtes pas que cil naturex office de aler ne soit li offices des piés?” “Ne ce ne doubte je pas”, dis je. “Se aucuns donques qui aler puisse, aille o ses piéz, et uns autres a cui cist naturex office defaille, s'apuie o ses mains et s'esforce de aler, li quiex de ces deus puet par droit estre tenu a plus fort?” *“Va oultre”,* dis je, “di le remanant; que nulz ne doubte que cil qui puet aler par le naturel office des piéz ne soit plus puissant que cil qui ne le puet pas.” “Mais li souverain bien qui est igaument propouséz aus mauvais et aus bons, li bon le requierent par le naturel office de vertu, et li mauvais s'esforcent de aconsuivre le par diverse couvoitise *des choses terriennes,* qui n'est pas naturex office de aconsuivre ce meismes bien. Cuidez tu que il soit autrement?” “Non”, dis je, “car la conclusion ensuivant est neis toute apparant, car des chosez que je avoie ottroiees, couvient il par force (*Ms* 18424, 108*r*) que li bon soient puissant et li mauvais *foible et* non puissant.”

“Tu me queurs”, dit ele, “a droit au devant et cis jugemens est itiex comme li mire suelent esperer *de leur malades, quant il aperceuent* la nature ja adreciee et contraistant a la maladie. Mes pour ce que je te voi tres prest a antendre, je te amonceleré plus espesses raisons. Car or regarde com grant apert *la foiblece et* l'enfermeté de mauvés hommes qui ne puent pas neis a ce parvenir a quoi leur naturel entencion les maine et

---

D conscience *B* consōmance.

34 C'est . . . requierent: *S om.*

34 aconsuient (-suivent): P^1 consuient C^2 consivent *BR* aconsuit; requierent: *BR* requiert; Ainsi (ensi, ainssint): P^1 aussi.

35 aconsuiaient: BC^1A^1 aconsuivent; le bien: P^1C^2 *pl.*

36 mauvais: *R* mal nez; est: *DS* est il.

37 donques: $P^1P^2C^1C^2$ *om.*; bon: *D* bien B (les) biens.

37-8 l'aconsuient . . . bon: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

37 et: P^2DS *om.*

38 li bon: *B* les biens; foible (P^1): *the rest* sont f.

39 dis: P^1 dit.

41 deus (*according to* $P^3A^1A^2M$): *the rest* deus choses; meisme: P^1C^2 *om.*

43 cel off. naturel: P^1 celle off. naturelle; accomplice: *B* accomplir *the rest* -isse.

45 l'acomplist: P^1C^2 accomplist.

46 Et (se): C^1b *om.*

47 desire: *R* vueil; oir: $P^3A^1A^2M$ savoir.

48 dist elle: *B* donques; aler: *R* l'air *B* nature; donné: *B om.* C^1RP^2D donnes.

50 aler: *B* loir; piés: B plais; Ne P^1C^2B *om.* C^1 *corrupt.*

51 Se: P^1 ce; o: *BDS* a C^1 de; uns: P^1C^2 *om.*

52 naturex off.: *Rb* (*except* P^2) *inverted;* defaille: *B om.*; o: *Bb* a C^1 de.

54 di le remanant: P^3 ou r. *M* o r. A^1 le manant A^2 du menant; que (nulz) (P^1C^2): *the rest* car.

55 le (nat): A^1 *om.*

57 li bon le requierent: *B* le b. le requiert; le (nat.) BRP^3A^1 *om.*

58 s'esforcent: *B* s'esforce; aconsuivre le: $P^3A^1A^2M$ l'acon.; diverse couv.: P^1 la div. couv. BRC^1 diverses couvoitises.

61-81 que li bon . . . force: P^1C^2 *om.*; (*passage cited according to* P^2).

62-3 li m. . . . puissant: *B om.*

64 queurs: *M* quēs *D* quers C^1 quiers *R* cors.

65 suelent esperer: *R* seulement esperent; *apperceuent*: *M* appercevoient.

67 tres: P^3M si A^1A^2 ci; prest: *R* puissant; te amonceleré: *B* tai monstre.

69 parvenir: *R* venir.

pres que ele ne les i contraint. Et *quel pooir auraient il,* se ceste naturel aide—qui tant est grant que a paines puet ele estre vaincue et qui tous jours va devant eus—les avoit delessiés *et deguerpis?* Mes regarde comme grant faute de poissance *et comme grant foiblece* est es mauvés hommes felons et desloiaus, *puis que si grant chose ne leur puet aidier.* (108*v*) Car il ne requierent pas petis loiers *ne decevables* ne volages et si ne les puent il aconsiure ne tenir, ançois defaillent de ça la somme et la hautece des choses, ne ne viennent pas li chetis a ce a quoi il travaillent de aconsiure par jour et par nuit; et en ce sont bien apparant les forces des bons hommes. Car aussi comme tu jugeroies *et tendroies* a tres puissant d'aler celui qui iroit a ses piéz jusques a ce lieu duquel nulle chose ne gerroit outre ou l'en peust aler, aussi convient il par force (*Ms* 18424 *ends*) que tu jugez a tres puissant celui qui *aconsuit et* prent la fin de toutez les chosez que on doit requerre et de la quelle nulle chose n'est oultre. Dont il s'ensuit ce qui gist souz ceste parole: c'est que cil mauvais homme sont, ce semble, deguerpiz de toutez forcez. Car pour quoy laissent il vertu et ensuivent les vices? N'est ce mie par ce que il ne cognoissent pas les biens? Mais quelle chose est plus foible *et plus chetive* que l'avugleté d'ignorance? Mais certez il ont bien cogneu les chosez que il doivent (28*rb*) ensuivre, mais lecherie *et couvoitise* les en destourne et les trebuche. Et aussi certes fait desatrempance les hommes foiblez qui ne peuent luitier contre les vicez. Ne sevent il donques que il laissent le bien et se tournent aus vices de leur gré? Mais en ceste maniere il ne laissent pas tant seulement a estre puissant, ainçois laissent a estre du tout. Car cil qui deguerpissent la commune fin de toutez les chosez qui sont, aussi laissent il ensemble a estre. Et par aventure il sembleroit a aucuns que ce fust merveille a dire, quant nous disons que li mauvais qui contiennent la plus grant partie des hommes ne sont pas *ne n'ont nul estre;* mais certainement ainsi est. Car ceulz qui sont mauvais, je ne reni pas qu'il ne soient mauvais, mais je ny et di que purement et simplement il ne sont pas. Car aussi comme tu pourroiez dire de la charoigne d'un homme que ce seroit uns hons mors, mais tu ne le pourroies pas simplement apeler homme, aussi ottroi je que li homme abandonnéz aus vicez *et aus mauvaistiéz* sont mauvais, mais je ne puis pas ottroier que il soient simplement *ne vraiement.* Car cele chose est qui retient ordre et garde nature; et la chose qui fault a ce, elle delaisse neis celui estre qui est assis en la nature de soi. Mais tu diras que li malvais peuent. Certes ce ne te ni je pas, mais ceste leur puissance ne descent pas des forces, mais de foiblece. Car il peuent les maus; les quiex il ne pourroient pas, s'il eussent en pooir de maindre *en la forme* (28*va*) *et* en la fesance des bons. Et ceste puissance demonstre plus clerement que il ne peuent niant. Car, si comme nous avons concueilli *et prouvé* un pou ci

---

70 les i: P^2 les A^1 lui; contraint (P^2): *the rest* constraint; auraient: *B* auroit.
71 qui (tous): P^1SA^2M que.
72 delessiés (*according to BR*): P^2 leskiez.
75 requierent: *DS* quierent.
76 de ça: *BR* jusques a.
77 viennent: *B* tiennent; li chetis: C^1 li caitif P^3 les choses.
79 jugeroies *et tend.*: C^1 juges et tiens.
80 nulle chose: *added according to B;* outre: *B* autre *DS* outre riens.
83 s'ensuit (*a*): b ensuit (A^2 suit).
84 cil: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ ces P^2DS li.
89 et les trebuche: P^1C^2 *om.*
90 luitier (*aD*): P^2 litier *M* luiter P^3 luicter *S* liuter A^1A^2 liurer.
91 se: *b* *om.*
92 de: $P^2P^3A^2MD$ et de.
93 deguerpissent: b*B* guerpissent (A^2 garpissent).
94 a (estre): P^2DS *om.*
97 ainsi est: P^2 *inverted DS* a. e. il.
98 reni: $P^3A^1A^2M$ nie.
103 cele: P^1 sele C^2 tele; est: *DS* si est P^2 se e.
105 neis: *B* liez; de soi: P^3 *om.*
106 ni je: *B* juge *R* uige je (*S*: ce ne te noiere mie); ceste: P^1C^2M certes.
107 descent: $P^3A^1A^2M$ vient C^1 deissent il; peuent: *B* prennent P^1C^2 ne p. pas.
108 maindre: *M* moindre *B* remaindre C^1 manoir P^3 demourer.
109 fesance: *R* feaute; Et ceste: P^1 et ce *R* car ceste; clerement: P^3 evidemment.
110 si: P^1 ci; *prouvé*: P^1 demonstre C^2 monstre.

devant, mal est niant et comme li malvais puissent tant seulement les malz, ceste conclusion est toute clere, que li mauvais ne peuent niant ne n'ont point de pooir." "C'est cler."

"Et pour ce que tu entendez quelle est la force de ceste puissance de mauvais, nous avons defeni un pou ci devant que nulle chose n'est plus puissant du souverain bien." "C'est voirs", dis je. "Mais cil meismes", dist elle, "ne puet faire mal." "Certes non." "Est il donques", dist elle, "aucuns qui cuide que li homme puissent faire toutez chosez?" "Non, s'il n'est hors de son sens." "Mais certez cist peuent faire les malz." "Certez", dis je, "je voudroie que il ne les peussent pas." "Donques comme cil qui est puissans de faire les biens puisse toutez chosez, et cil qui sont puissant de faire les malz ne puissent pas toutez chosez, c'est chose clere que cil qui peuent les maulz sont moins puissans *que cilz qui peuent les biens.* Et encores, a ceste conclusion prouver, nous aide ce que nous avons monstré devant: que toute puissance est du nombre des chosez que on doit requerir et que toutez les chosez que on doit requerir sont raportees a bien, aussi comme a une hautece de leur nature. Mais la puissance de faire mal ne puet estre raportee a bien; donques ne est elle pas du nombre des chosez que on doit requerir. Mais toute puissance doit (28*vb*) estre *desiree et* requise; donques est ce clere chose que la possibleté de faire mal n'est pas puissance. Et de toutez ces chosez apert il que li bon sont certainement puissant et li mauvais sans doubte sont non puissant. Et est clere chose que celle sentence de Platon est vraie qui dit que li seul sage peuent faire ce que il desirent et li mauvais hanter ce que il leur plaist, mais ce que il desirent, *c'est venir a souverain bien,* il n'ont pooir de acomplir. Car li mauvais font ce qu'il leur plaist, quant par les chosez en quoy il se delitent il cuident aconsuivre celui bien que il desirent; mais il ne l'aconsuivent pas, car vicez ne viennent pas a beneurté.

[METRE II.]

Qui les couverturez de leur vain aournement osteroit aus roys orgueilleus que tu vois seoir en hault en leur chaere, vestuz de pourpre resplendissant, avironnéz de tristes armes, menaçans par crueuse bouche, soufflans par rage de cuer, il verroit lors que cil seigneur portent dedens leur courage chaenes estroites, car lecherie tourmente d'une part leur cuer de glout venim; ire troublable qui en eulz eslieve les floz *de ses turbacions* tourmente d'autre part leur pensee, ou douleur les tient lasséz et pris, ou esperance escouloriable *et decevable* les tourmente. Donques, comme tu voies un chief

---

112 ne (n'ont): P^1C^2 et.
112-3 ne . . . pooir: P^3 *om.*
113 C'est cler: B *om.*
117 dist elle (ne p.): BC^1b *om.*; dist elle: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.* (R: dit est).
118 cuide: B cuident.
119 de son: C^1BP^3S du; peuent (pueent, *etc.*): P^1C^2 puet.
120 peussent: C^1P^2 puissent BR vousissent (C^1: puissent faire).
121 de (faire): P^2C^2 *om.*
126 et que . . . requerir: BC^1b *om.*; sont: b qui s. C^1 les queles s. B et s.
127 a une hautece: B aunōce; leur . . . de: B *om.*
130 ce: P^1 *om.* (S: est ceste ch. clere); possibleté: P^2P^3DS possibilite BR puissance.
131 Et: P^2 *om.*
132 et li . . . puissant: C^1 *om.*; sont non puiss.: P^2DS sont nient p. A^2 ne sont p.; clere chose: P^2DS *inverted.*
134 que il (leur): BP^2P^3DS qui M que.
135 *a* (P^1C^2): *the rest* au.
136 qu'il: BP^2S qui M q'lz.
137 aconsuivre: P^1C^2 consuivre; ne: P^1 *om.*
137-8 que . . . acons. pas: B *om.*
137 l'aconsuivent: C^1 le síuent b l'aconsiuront.
138 vicez . . . pas: R il ne mainent mie vies; a beneurté: B de b. R a bonneurtes.

METRE II

1 vain aournement: b *pl.* A^3P^4 bons a.
2 chaere: BC^1P^4 *pl.*
3 tristes: R terres tres; armes: P^1C^2 ames; par: C^1RA^3b de; crueuse: RP^4M cruele B cruelles C^1 *om.*
4 seigneur: R saingneur.
6 troublable: DS tourbable; qui: P^1C^2 qui est.
6 *ses* (aA^3P^4): b *om.*; *turbacions*: P^1 tribulacions.
7 lasséz (a *except* R; A^3): P^4 lassiez RD laciez $P^3A^1A^2M$ lasches P^2S lachies.
8 *et decevable* (aA^3P^4): b *om.*

porter tant de tyrans, il ne fait pas ce que il desire quant il est esprains *et confunduz* par ces felons seigneurs.

[PROSE III.]

Vois tu donques en com grant ordure li mauvais sont tourné et de quelle clarté resplendissent li bon? (29*ra*) En ce apert il que aus bons leurs loiers ne leur faudront jamés ne aus malvais leurs tourmens. Car des chosez qui sont faites, celle chose pour quoy on les fait semble par droit que elle en soit li loiers, si comme il avient a celui qui queurt en l'estade que la coronne gist illec pour quoy on queurt et ce est li loiers *du cors.* Mais nous avons monstré que beneurté est cil biens meismes pour cui toutez chosez sont faitez. Donques est cil meismes bien propouséz aus euvres humaines aussi comme loiers communs. Et cist ne puet estre dessevréz des bons, car nulz par droit, d'illec en avant, qui soit sans bien ne sera apeléz bons; pour quoy les hommes de bonnez meurs leurs propres loiers ne les delaissent pas. Ja soit ce donques que li mauvais se forcenent tant comme il leur plaist *contre les bons,* toutevois au sage homme sa coronne ne li decharra pas ne ne flestrira. Car estrange mauvaistié ne toult pas aus bons courages leur propre honneur. Mais se aucuns bons s'esjoist d'*aucun autre* bien que il eust pris dehors, certez ou aucuns autres ou cil neis qui le li eust donné le li peust tollir; mais pour ce que a chascun sa propre proece li donne ce loier, lors faudra il a ce loier avoir quant il delaissera a estre bons. Au derrenier, comme touz loiers soit requis pour ce que on croit que il soit bons, qui seroit cil qui jugeroit que cil qui a le bien dedens soy ne fust perçonniers de loier? Mais de quel loier? Certes du tres bel et du tres grant de touz loiers. Car remembre toy de ce corre- (29*rb*) laire que je te donné si noble un pou ci devant et le cueil en ceste maniere: comme biens meismes soit beneurté, certaine chose est que tuit li bon, par ce meismes qu'il sont bon, sont fait beneuré. Mais cil qui beneuréz sont, il couviant que il soient dieu. Donques est itiex li loiers des bons: que nul jour ne le destruira, nulle mauvaistié ne l'occurcira, ne puissance de nul ne l'apeticera, *c'est a savoir* estre fait diex.

Et comme ces chosez soient ainsi, nul sage hom certez ne puet doubter de la *pardurable et* non dessevrable paine des mauvais. Car, comme bien et mal, et paines et loiers soient contrairez, il couvient que, aussi comme nous

---

9 esprains: $P^3A^1A^2M$ espris.

10 ces (P^1C^1b): C^2BRA^3 ses P^4 les.

PROSE III.

1 li: P^3 *om.*

2 que: P^1C^2B *om.*

3 leurs (tourm.): *BD* les.

4 celle: *DS* cest le.

5 queurt: C^2 cueurt C^1 quert; en C^1b (*except* A^2) a; estade que: C^1 estaque que *B* estat de quoy.

6 *cors* (cours): $P^1C^2BP^2$ corps.

7-8 pour . . . propouséz: *DM* *om.*

7 cui ($P^1P^2A^1A^2$): $C^1C^2P^3S$ qui BR quoi.

8 propouséz (*a*): *b* *om.*

9 aussi: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

11 delaissent: C^1Rb (*except DS*) delaisse.

12 se forcenent (P^1): C^1C^2BR se forssenent *b* s'esforcent.

13-4 ne ne fl.: *B* *om.*

14 flestrira: *RD* flechira; toult (C^2BRP^3): SM tolt P^1 toust $P^2A^1A^2$ tost C^1D taut.

15 bons: $P^3A^1A^2M$ homme; s'esjoist: C^1 s'esjoisist P^1C^2 s'esjoissent; *autre* (*a*) *b* estrange.

16 eust (donné): P^1C^2 *om.*; qui . . . donné: C^1BR qui d. li eust *b* (*except S*) qui d. le li eust *S* qui donne li ostast sil li.

17 peust: C^1 pourroit; chascun: P^1 chascuns; ce (loier): *R* cel *B* son.

18 lors . . . loier: P^1C^2 *om.*; ce (loier av.): C^1BR son C^2 *om.*

19 soit (requis): *BR* soient.

21 de loier (bBC^1; *R* du l.): P^1 des loiers C^2 de louiers; Mais . . . loier: *BR* *om.*; de (quel): P^1C^2 du; Certes: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

21-2 Certes . . . grant: P^2DS *om.*; du tres: $P^3A^1A^2M$ le plus (*repeated*).

22 ce: P^1C^2 *om.*

22-3 te donné: BC^1DS te donnai $P^3A^1A^2M$ t'ai donne.

23 si noble: *placed after* devant *in b* (*S om.*); le cueil ($P^2A^1A^2M$): P^3D recueil BRC^1 le quel P^1C^2 le cueilli *S* recoeille.

24 certaine: *B* ceste.

24-5 par . . . bon: $P^1C^2A^1$ *om.*

25 sont bon: *B* *om.*

28 *c'est* . . . diex: P^3 *om.*; estre: *R* ceste.

29 hom: P^1C^2 *om.*

30 *et* non dessevrable (C^1): P^1C^2 *om.* P^2 -able (deceu *deleted; superscript* separ) *the rest* et non decevable.

31 soient: *B* aient.

veons avenir ou loier du bien, que aussi aviengne, de la contraire partie, en la paine du mal. Aussi donques comme proece est li loiers aus bons, aussi est mauvaistiéz tourment aus mauvais. Donques, quiconques est surpris *ou tourmentéz* de paine, il ne doubte pas que il ne soit surpris de mal. Se li mauvais, donques, veulent prisier eulz meismes, leur puet il sembler que il soient sens partie de tourment, puis que il sont telz que felonnie la derreniere *et la fins* de touz maulz ne les surprent pas tant seulement dehors, mais neis les tourmente dedens? Mais voy aussi de la contraire part des bons, quelle paine fait compaignie aus mauvais! Car tu as apris un pou ci devant que toute chose qui est faite est une, et que celle chose une est biens; par quoy il s'ensuit (29*va*) que toute chose qui est faite, celle meismes, ce semble, est biens. Et par ceste maniere donques s'ensuit il que toute chose qui fault a bien, elle fault a estre; dont il s'ensuit que li mauvais laissent a estre ce que il avoient esté, mais l'autre forme du corps humain demonstre encores que il ont esté hommes. Pour quoy, puis que il sont converti en malice, certez aussi ont il perdue la nature humaine. Mais comme sa seule proece puisse eslever chascun homme seur les autres hommes, il couvient que cil que leur mauvaistiéz a *abessiéz et* getéz hors de la condicion humaine soient mis souz la merite des hommes. Donques avient il que, se tu en vois aucun qui soit transformé en vices, tu ne peus pas *prisier ne* cuider que il soit hom. S'il est ardans de avarice et que il soit par force ravisseur de estranges richeces, tu diras qu'il est semblable au lou. S'il est felons et sans repons et abandonne sa langue aus tençons, tu le comperras au chien. S'il est agueteur repos et s'esjoist de embler par baraz, tu le metras avec les goupis. S'il est desatrempéz *et fremissans* en ire, on doit croire que il porte courage de lion. S'il est paoureus et fuitis et creint les chosez qui ne doivent pas estre creintez, on le doit tenir pour semblable aus cers. S'il est pereceus, esbahiz et laschez, il vit comme un asne. S'il est legiers et mouvable de courage et treschange ses estudez, il est compains aus oiseaus. S'il est plungié es ordez (29*vb*) et soillieez luxurez, il est detenuz ou delit de l'orde truie. Dont il s'ensuit que cil qui deguerpist proece et delaisse a estre hom, comme il ne puisse pas trespasser en condicion divine, que il soit muéz en beste.

[METRE III.]

Eurus, *li vent d'oriant*, arriva les vailez Ulixez, duc de Narice, et ses nefs,

---

32 du bien (*BRC*^{1}): P^1C^2 de b. *b* du bon.
33 paine (*a*): *b* partie; donques comme: P^1 *inverted;* li: *b om.* BC^2 le.
37 partie: *B* pitie.
37-8 felonnie la derreniere *et*: P^1 fel. est C^2 fel. et.
38 ne les: P^1C^2 et la derreniere ne les; surprent pas: P^2DS puet sourprendre.
40 part: $P^3A^1A^2MS$ partie; quelle (*a except B*): *DS* que le *Bb* (*except DS*) que la.
41-2 qui . . . toute chose: *B om.*
41 est faite: *S* este; est une: P^3A^2M une est faicte une A^1DS une.
43 meismes: *Bb* m. neis; ce: P^3A^1M se; est (biens): P^1C^2R *om.* A^2 est a (C^1: il s'ensuit que toute cose qui est faite est une et que cose une est biens).
44 toute chose: C^1 de tout ce; elle: P^1C^2DS *om.*
44-5 dont . . . esté: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
46 Pour quoy (*a except R; DS*): RP^2 par quoy $P^3A^1A^2M$ car.
49 (cil) que (RA^1: P^2S *que*): *the rest* qui.
52 et que il (*b*): *BR* que il C^1 quil P^1C^2 qui.
53 ravisseur: C^2 ravisseours BRC^1P^2DS ravissierres.
55 comperras (P^1BS): C^1 comparras C^2 compereras *b* (*except S*) compareras *R* comparageras; agueteur (P^1P^3): A^1 aguiteur A^2 aguitur *M* aguetur C^2RP^2 aguetieres BC^1DS agaitieres.
56 goupis (P^1; *b except* P^2P^3): C^2 goulpiz C^1 gourpil *BR* gorpilz P^2 gourpis P^3 renars.
58 creintez: $C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ craintes BRC^1P^2DS cremues.
59 esbahiz: C^1b (*except* A^2P^2) et esb.
61 compains: $P^3A^1A^2M$ compagnon; est plungié (P^1C^2): *the rest* se plunge; es: P^1C^2 et: ordez: *S* ordures; soillieez: BRC^1P^2DS es soil.
62 delit (*a*): *b* lit.
63 deguerpist: P^3 delaisse: delaisse: P^3 *om.*
69 soit: P^1C^2 ne s.; muéz: P^1 et muez; beste: *R* bonneurte.

METRE III.

1 de Narice (*B; b except* A^2): P^1 de varice P^4 danarice C^1 de narices RA^3 dauarice C^2 de auarice A^2 da avarice; ses: P^1 ces.

foloians par la mer, en l'ile ou *Circe* la bele deesse, fille du soleil, demeure et melle a ses nouviaus hostes beuragez fez par enchantemens. Et puis que sa main puissant sus les herbez les a muéz en diversez manierez, li uns est couvers de forme de sanglier, li autres est muéz en lion de Marmorique et li craissent les dens et les onglez. Li autres est nouvellement muéz en leu et, quant il veult pleurer, il ule. Li autres comme tigres indians s'en va debonnairement par les maisons. Mais ja soit ce que li diex *Mercurius* Archadians, volans avec les oisiaus, ait eu pitié du duc Ulixes pourpris de divers maulz et le ait deslié de la pestilance de s'ostesse, toutevois si marinier avoient ja trait en leur bouche et beu les mauvais beuragez; cil qui estoient devenu porcel avoient ja mué la viande du pain pour mengier les glandez. Nulz de leurs membrez ne leur demeure mais enterin; il ont perdu les voiz et les corps. La seule pensee leur remaint estable qui *pleure et* gemist les fantosmes que elle seuffre.

O certes, *je di que* ceste main *de ceste deesse* est *trop vilz et* trop foible ne ses herbez ne sont mie puissans; (30*ra*) que ja soit ce que elles puissent muer les membrez du corps, toutevois ne puent elles muer les cuers. Dedens est reposte la vigueur des hommes en la secree tour *de leur cuer, c'est la force de raison.* Cist venim detraient *et abessent* a eus plus puissamment homme *que li venim Circe.* Car il sont si cruel que il trespassent *et trespercent du tout* le courage dedens et ne nuisent pas au corps, mais il se forsennent a destruire homme par plaie de pensee *et le destruient.*"

[PROSE IV.]

Lors dis je: "Je le recognois ne ne voi pas que on puisse dire par droit que li mauvais, ja soit ce que il gardent encores la forme du corps humain, ne soient muéz en bestez par la qualité de leurs ames. Mais je ne voisisse pas des mauvais, de cui la pensee crueuse et felonnesse se forsenne en la destruction des bons, que il leur loisist a ce faire." "Certez", dist elle, "ne il ne leur loist pas, si comme je te monstrerai en lieu couvenable. Mais toutevois, se ce que on croit que il leur loise leur estoit tolu, *si que il ne*

2 foloians (*a*): $P^3A^1A^2$ feloians A^3P^4S folians P^2 foloi *M* flotans (*after erasure*); fille: P^1C^2 *om.*

3 enchantemens: b ses en.

3-4 Et . . . puissant: P^1C^2 *om.* (*B*: et pour que sa maison puissant).

4 manierez: P^4 memoires; uns: P^1 un.

5-6 li autres . . . onglez: A^3P^4 *om.*

5 en lion (*a*): b en forme de lion; lion: *B* lieu.

7-8 et quant . . . Mais: A^3 *om.*

7 ule (P^1C^2M): BP^2DS ulle *R* usle $C^1P^3A^1A^3$ urle; indians: *B* yndien $P^3A^1A^2M$ d'ynde.

9 eu: $P^1C^2A^2$ en *R* em; de (divers): P^2DS en.

10 s'ostesse: P^3 son hostesse *B* science.

12 mué: *B* muee $P^3A^1A^2M$ meu; la: BA^3P^4 leur; du pain: P^1C^2 *om.*

13 glandez: C^1P^4M glans.

14 les (voiz): P^4 la; les (corps): P^4P^2DS le; corps: *B* c. entierement; remaint: *R* remēt.

15 gemist: *B* g. de cuer parfondement; fantosmes: P^1 fanstosmes C^1 fanthomes *M* fantausmes.

16 O certes: P^1 que c. *R* ho c. A^1A^2 or c.; *je di que*: BRP^2 di je que C^1P^4 di je *DS om.*

17 puissans: *B* p. ne fortes; elles puissent: A^3P^4B *sing.*

18 muer: *B* m. a sa volente enterinement; du corps (P^1C^2): *the rest* des corps (P^2 des cors); puent: $P^1C^2A^2A^3$ puet (elle); *followed by* pas *in* C^1C^2b (*except* P^2M) *R* mie: (*B*: ne pueent elles pas muer en nulle maniere les membres du corps, toutevoies (*repetition*) aussi ne puent elles p muer les cuers des psones).

20 detraient (detreent): *D* detraihent *a* (*except* C^1) detranchent A^3P^4 detrenchant; a eus: P^1C^2 *om.*

21 si: P^1C^2 *om.*

22 *du tout*: *B* du t. outreement; nuisent: P^1 nuise.

PROSE IV

1 ne ne: *B* ne je ne A^2 je ne; que . . . . dire: *b om.* C^2 que on doie d.; par droit: *B om.* P^3 p. dit *M* p. d'it.

3 en: *R* em P^1C^2 es; voisisse: BRP^2A^1 vousisse C^1DS vausisse C^2P^3M voulsisse A^2 volsisse.

4 et felonnesse: *BR om.*

5 il: P^1C^2 *om.*; loisist (C^1; *b except* P^2A^2): A^2 loisit $P^1C^2P^2$ laisist *B* laissast *R* leissist.

6 loist: $P^1C^2RP^2$ laist; lieu: *B* lieu et en temps.

7 loise (P^3A^1): A^2 leise *M* loist aP^1P^2DS laisse; loise leur: *B om.*

peussent nuire ne mal faire aus bons, certez la paine des cruex hommes leur seroit alegiee de grant partie. Car ja soit ce que il ne semble pas par aventure estre chose creable a aucunes gens, il couvient que li malvais soient plus chetif et plus maleureus quant il *portent a fin et* parfaitement font ce que il couvoitent que s'il ne peussent leur couvoitisez acomplir. Car se c'est chetiveté de voloir mal fere, plus grant chetiveté est de pooir, car sens le pooir la chetive volenté ne vendroit jamais (30*rb*) au fait. Donques, comme chascune de ces chosez ait sa chetiveté, *c'est a savoir vouloir et pooir et faire,* il couvient que cil soient contrains par troiz maleurtéz qui veulent et peuent et parfaitement font les felonniez *et les mauvaistiéz.* "Je m'y acort", dis je; "mais je desire forment que il perdent tost ceste maleurté, c'est qu'il soient despoillié du pooir de mal faire."

"Si seront il", dist elle, "plus tost par aventure ou que tu ne veuls ou que il ne cuident. Car, en si brieves bonnes de ceste vie, nulle chose n'y est si tardive que courage meismement qui n'est pas mortiex doie cuidier que elle soit longue a atendre: *se elle est du nombre des chosez* des quiex la grant esperance et la haulte joie des chosez faites est souvent destruite par fin soudaine et desesperee, ceste chose certez leur establist fin de chetiveté. Car se felonnie fait les chetis, il couvient que cil soit plus chetis qui plus longuement vit felons; et ces felons jugeroie je a tres maleureus *et tres chetis,* se leur malice n'estoit fenie au moins par la derreniere mort. Car se nous avons concluse verité de la maleurté de mauvaistié, il apert clerement que celle chetiveté est sens fin de quoy nous sommes certain que elle est pardurable." Lors dis je: "Certes ceste conclusion est merveilleuse et grieve a ottroier, mais je cognois bien que elle s'acorde trop aus chosez que nous avons ottroiees avant." "Tu en as", dist elle, "droite estimacion. Mais quiconques cuide que dure chose soit de soi acorder a conclusion, il est droiz que il demonstre (30*va*) ou que aucuns faulz a esté mis devant, ou que il demonstre que la jointure des proposicions n'est pas cause suffisant de neccessaire conclusion; ou se ce non, puis que les premisses sont ottroiees, il n'est nulle riens pour quoy il doie blasmer l'argument. Car ce que je te dirai ja ne semblera pas estre moins merveillable, mais par les chosez que nous avons prisez ceste est aussi necessaire." "Quelle chose est ce?" dis je. "Certez", dist elle, "ce est que li mauvais felon sont plus beneuré *ou moins chetif* qui compairent les tourmens qu'il ont deserviz que se nulle paine de justice ne les chastiast. Ne ce ne vueil je pas ore dire—que aucuns pourroit penser—que les meurs des mauvais soient chastiéz par la venchence *de la paine* et soient ramenéz a voie de droit par la paour du

---

8 *nuire*: *P^1C^2* vivre *DS* luire.
8-9 leur seroit: *P^1* *inverted.*
12 s'il: *P^1* cil.
13 se c'est: *B* ce est; de vol. . . . chetiveté: *P^1C^2 om*.; de (pooir): *BRC^1b* (*except A^1*) du.
14 vendroit: *C^1S* venroit *P^2* vaudroit *A^1* vandroit *P^3M* vauldroit; au fait (*P^1C^2R*): *C^1* a f. *Bb* (*except A^2*) en f. *A^2* en fin fait.
15 de ces: *P^1C^2R* des.
15-6 *et* (*pooir*): *BRb* (*except DS*) *om.*
20 seront: *P^1C^2* seroit *C^1* serroient *P^2P^3* feront.
20-1 veuls ou que il ne: *P^1C^2* *om.*
20 veuls (veus): *b* (*except P^2*): vuelles (vueilles).
21 bonnes: *P^3* bournes.
22-3 que . . . atendre (*editor's correction*): *all manuscripts read* atendre (*P^1C^2* entendre) que elle soit longue.
24 grant (*Rb*): *P^1C^2B* haulte *C^1* *om.*; joie: *B* chose.
26 cil: *P^1C^2* il *$P^3A^1A^2M$* cellui.
27 jugeroie je: *P^1C^2* jugeroie *C^1* jugerons.
30 chetiveté: *P^1C^2* maleurte.
31 Lors dis je: *B* *om.*; Certes: *$P^1C^1C^2$* *om.*; merveilleuse: *BRb* malheureuse.
34 soi acorder: *P^1C^2* *inverted.*
35-6 ou que auc. . . . demonstre: *BA^2* *om.*
35 a (esté): b (*except P^2*) ait.
36 il: *P^1C^2* *om.*; demonstre: *RP^3A^1M* monstre; il dem. que: *C^1* *om.*
36-7 n'est pas cause suffisant: *P^1C^2* ne cause suffisans.
38 l'argument: *BR* larguement *D* larghuement.
40 ceste: *DS* elle.
42 compairent (*P^1*): *A^1M* comparent *B* par ont *the rest* comperent.
43 chastiast: *$P^3A^1A^2M$* chastoiast.
44 chastiéz: *C^1* castijes *B* chaciez *RP^3S* chastiees *D* cachies.

tourment, et que il doingnent neis aus autres example de fuir les vicez; mais encores en une autre maniere croi je que li mauvais sont plus maleureus quant il ne sont pas puni, ja soit ce que nulle raison de chastiement ne nul regars de example n'y soit ajustéz." "Et quelle sera celle maniere", dis je, "autrez que celles qui sont devant ditez?" Lors dist elle: "N'avons nous pas ottroié que li bons sont beneureus et que li mauvais sont chetis?" "Oy", dis je.

"Donques", dist elle, "se aucuns biens estoit ajustéz a la chetiveté d'aucun, n'est il pas plus beneureus que cil qui a sa chetiveté n'a nul ajustement de bien?" "Oy, ce me semble", dis je. (30*vb*) "Et que diraies tu du chetif qui n'a nul bien ajusté a sa chetiveté et, par dessus touz les maulz par quoy il est chetif, se aucuns autres maulz li estoit ajustéz? Ne le doit on pas jugier a moult plus maleureus que celui chetif de cui la maleurté est relevee par la participacion d'aucun bien?" "Pour quoy ne seroit?" dis je. "Donques ont certes", dist elle, "li mauvais, quant il sont puni, aucune chose de bien ajusté *a leur chetiveté*, c'est a savoir la paine meismes *que il seuffrent* qui est bonne par la raison de justice, et, quant il meismes eschapent sens tourment, il ont aucune chose de mal oultre les maulz que il ont faiz, c'est a savoir faute de paine que tu as ottroié qui est maulz par la merite de felonnie." "Ce ne puis je nier."

"Moult sont donques plus maleureus li mauvais quant il sont a tort delivréz de paine que quant il sont puni par droituriere vengence. Mais c'est aperte chose que il est droiz que li mauvais soient puni, et est *mauvaistié et* tort que il eschapent sens paine." "Qui pourroit ce nier?" "Mais", dist elle, "pourra nulz homs nier que tout ce qui est droiz ne soit bon et, aussi du contraire, que toute chose qui est tort, clere chose est que ce est maulz." Lors dis je: "Certez ces chosez s'ensuient des chosez que nous avons conclusez un pou ci devant. Mais je te pri que tu me diez, savoir mon, se tu *t'acordez a* delaissier nulz tormens aus ames, puis que li corps est feniz par mort?" "Certez, oy, grant", dist elle; "des quiex je cuit que li un seront demené par aspreté de paine, li au- (31*ra*) tre par espuriable debonaireté. Mes mi conseuz n'est pas maintenant a determiner de ces chosez. Mais nous avons ce dit jusques ci pour ce que tu cogneussez que la puissance des mauvais, qui te sembloit estre trop sens dignité, est nulle, et *que, des malvais* dont tu te pleignoies que il n'estoient pas puni, que

---

46 doingnent: P^3 donnent; fuir: *B* fouir; vicez: *B* v. contraires a toutes personnes.

47 croi je: *B* croire fermement sanz nul moien et sanz nulle excuşacion; sont (plus): *B* s. et seront.

49 example (essa-, exe-): P^1 examplaire; ajustéz: *after this word B adds* et ainsi vivent et muerent maleureusement comme sanz punicion mondaine la quelle chose est contre eulz et a la confusion de leur sauvement spirituel.

49-50 dis je autrez: *B om.*

50 celles qui sont: $P^3A^1A^2M$ les; ditez: *B* d. et especifiees selon rayson; dist elle: *B* d. e. en ceste maniere.

51 ottroié: *B* o. et dit; beneureus: *B* b. entierement a leur sauvement; chetis: *B* ch. a leur dampnement.

53 dist elle: *B* d. e. en ceste maniere; estoit: C^2 estoínt P^1R estoient.

55 que: *b* (*except* A^2) *om.*

56 ajusté: P^1C^2 *om.*

57 se: *inserted according to B;* maulz li estoit: P^3 mal lui est.

58 moult: C^1C^2Bb (*except DS*) *om.*; relevee: P^1C^2B revelee.

60 quant . . . puni (*R* pugni): P^1 *om.*

63 ont.: *b* ont en ce; de mal: P^1C^2 *om.*; faiz: C^1 souffert *b om.*

67 droituriere: P^1C^2 droiture; (*B*: sont puniz de leurs meffais par droituriere et raysonnable vengance de punicion de corps).

68 que il: P^1C^2 qui; droiz: *B* d. et rayson; puni: *B adds* selonc le meffait qu'il ont fait, quar droit le veult que meffais soient puniz et amendez selonc le fait la penitence.

72 maulz (maus): *Bb* (*except* P^2) mal.

73 un pou (RP^3): P^1C^2 *om.* *DS* un pau A^2M un po *the rest* un poi.

75 oy (P^1): *the rest* oil.

75-6 je cuit que: P^3 *om.* A^1A^2M je croi que.

76 seront: *B* se sont.

77 espuriable (*a except B;* P^2): P^3A^1 espuriaule A^2 esperiaule *M* espuriale *DS* espurgable *B* esperable; debonaireté: P^1 de beneurte *D* boneurete *R* debonneurte C^2 debonnerete C^1 de boínairete; mi (P^1R): C^2 nu C^1 nuls *B* mon *S* mes *the rest om.*

78 ce (dit): *b om.*; cogneussez (C^1A^1MDS; A^2 -ousses): *the rest* cognoisses.

79 trop: C^1b *om.*

80 te: P^1C^2 *om.*; pleignoies (P^1C^2): *R* complaingnoies *the rest* plaignoies.

tu veissez qu'il ne seront jamés sens les tourmens de leur malvaistié et du laisir de mal faire, que tu priaies que il fust tost feniz, que tu aprissez que il n'est pas lons et que encorez seroit il plus maleureuz s'il estoit plus lons, et tres malheureuz s'il estoit pardurablez. Aprés ce *nous t'avons monstré* que plus maleureus sont li mauvais quant il eschapent sens leur droituriere paine que quant il sont puni par droituriere vengence. Et de ceste sentence s'ensuit il que il soient lors contraint, au derrenier, de plus grief tourment, quant on cuide que il n'en soient pas puni."

Lors dis je: "Quant je regarde tes raisons, je ne cuide pas que on puisse dire nulle chose plus vraiement. Et, se je retourne aus jugemens des hommes, qui est cil a cui il ne sembleroit qu'il ne deust ces chosez croire ou au moins voulentiers oir *neis s'il ne les vouloit croire?* "Certez", dist elle, "ainsi *le deuroient il faire, mais il ne veulent.* Car il ont si leurs yeulz acoustuméz aus tenebres *des chosez terriennes* qu'il ne les peuent eslever a la lumiere de clere verité, et sont semblablez aus oisiaus a cui la nuit enlumine leur (31*rb*) regart et li jours l'avugle. Car quant il regardent non mie l'ordre des chosez, mes leur *tenebreus* entalentement, il cuident ou que li laisirs des maus fere ou que li eschapemens sans paine soit beneureuz. Mais regarde le jugement de la loy pardurable. Se tu conformes ton courage aus meilleurs, tu n'as mestier de juge qui te doint *loenge ne* loier, *que ta conscience te loe quant elle te dit que* tu te es conjoins aus plus nobles des bons. Se tu as flechi ton estude aus peeurs, ne quier pas *juge ne* vencheur hors de toy, *car ta conscience meismes t'acuse et te dit que* tu meismes te es boutéz es pirez estaz. Aussi comme se tu regardoiez par diversez foiz la terre orde *et boeuse* et le ciel, et toutez chosez cessassent par dehors *si que tu ne fussez ne en ciel ne en terre ne ne veissez riens plus,* il te seroit avis, par la seule raison du regarder, que tu seroiez aucune foiz en la boe et aucune foiz es estoilles. Mais li peuples ne regarde pas ces chosez *ne ne te juge pas a tel comme ta conscience te juge.* Que ferons nous donques? Nous acorderons nous *et nous confermerons* a ceulz que nous avons monstréz que il sont semblables aus bestez? Et que diras tu de ce: se uns hons avoit du tout perdu la veue et *ne li souvenist pas, ains* eust oublié que il eust onques veu et cuidast que il ne li fausist riens a avoir toute perfection humaine, *nous qui verrions ces meismes chosez* ne cuiderions pas que cil et ceulz qui seroient de semblable opinion ne fussent avugle? (31*va*) Car

---

81 veissez (*a*): *b* voies; qu'il: P^1 qui; seront: *B* seroient.
82 laisir (P^3 loisir): *DS* laissier; tost: *R* tout *B* touz; feniz: *b* feniz et.
83 seroit (*a*): *b* (*except* P^2) seroient P^2 seront; il (plus): P^1C^2 *om.*; plus lons: *B* plus loez lons.
86 par: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ par leur.
87 au derrenier: P^1 au derreniere C^2 au darreniere; grief (*BR*): C^1b gries (griefz) P^1 grant C^2 grans.
89 tes: P^2D ces; raisons: P^2 choses.
90 vraiement: P^3 vraie; se: P^1C^2 *om.*; retourne: $P^3A^1A^2M$ tourne C^1 tour.
91 ne (deust): C^1Rb (*except* P^2) *om.*; ou: P^1C^2R *om.*
92 au moins . . . *croire*: *R om.*; acoustumez aus ten.: P^1 aus ten. ac.
94 acoustuméz . . . peuent: A^2 *om.*
97 entalentement: *B* enluminemens.
97-8 il cuid. . . . eschapemens: P^1 *om.*
98 laisirs: *B* loiers *R* desirs.
100 te doint: P^2 *om.* RC^1DS te doinst *M* te donne; *que* (P^1C^2): *the rest* car.
101 *te* (loe): P^1C^2 ne; tu te es (*BR*): *the rest* tu es; conjoins: *B* conjointiez.
102 peeurs (P^1P^2): RA^1A^2DS pieurs P^3M pires *B* paours C^2 (au) paieur (C^1: estude empeurs).
104 pirez: P^1C^2 perez.
105 *boeuse*: P^1 boeue C^2 bossue *D* breusse; toutez: *b* t. ces.
106 *en* (*ciel*): P^2D au *S* ou.
109 *ta*: C^1 te *S* la *D* li.
109-10 Nous ac. . . . *confermerons*: *B* nous nous ac. nous nous conf.
110 *confermerons*: P^3A^1MD conformerons *S* conf'merons.
111 se: P^1 ce.
112 du tout: P^3 *om.* C^2 *after* perdu C^1 *after* veue; oublié: *b* du tout oub.; *souvenist* (*aM*): *the rest* souvenoit (P^3 en souv.).
113 que il (*aS*): P^2 qui *the rest* que
114 *verrions* ($P^1C^2P^2$): *BR* verrons C^1S verriemes *D* vorriemes $P^3A^1A^2M$ veons; *ces mesmes chosez*: *M* ces meismes $P^3A^1A^2$ ce m.; cuiderions: P^2 cuideriens *DS* cuideriemes $P^3A^1A^2$ cuiderions nous *BR* cuiderons n. C^1 cuideriemes n.
114-5 cil et ceulz (C^2RP^2): P^1 cil est c. *DS* cils et cil *B* ceulz et celles C^1 tout cil $P^3A^1A^2M$ cellui ou ceulz.
115 seroient: C^2 seroínt.

certez aussi ne s'acorderoit pas li peuples a ce *que je te vueil dire* qui est *apuié et* soustenu par aussi fors fondemens de raisons, *c'est a savoir* que plus maleureus sont cil qui font tort a autrui que cil qui le seuffrent." "Je voudroie oir", dis je, "ces meismes raisons."

"Niez tu", dist elle, "que tuit mauvais ne soient digne de tourment?" "Ce ne nie je pas", dis je. "Mais nous sommes certain par moult de raisons que li mauvais sont maleureuz." "C'est voirs", dis je. "Donques ne doubtes tu pas que cil qui sont digne de tourment ne soient chetis?" "Ce couvient il", dis je. "Se tu donques estoiez assis *juges", dist elle, "ou* cognoisseur des chosez, le quel cuideroiez tu que on deust tourmenter: ou celui qui a fait le tort ou celui qui l'a souffert?" "Je ne doute pas", dis je, "que je ne feisse suffisant amende a celui qui auroit souffert le tort par la douleur de celui qui le li auroit fait." "Donques t'est il avis que li feseur du tort est plus chetif que li receveur?" "Ce s'ensuit bien", dis je. "Par ce donques et par autres causez apuiees seur ceste racine que l'ordure de pechié face les hommes par sa propre nature chetis, apert il que li tors que on fait n'est pas la chetiveté de celui qui reçoit le tort, mais de celui qui fait le tort. Mais certez", dist elle, "li orateur, *li accuseur et li avocat* font ore le contraire. Car il s'esforcent a esmouvoir la pitié des juges pour ceulz qui ont souffert *et receu* les chosez grievez et aigrez, (31*vb*) comme on deust plus droitement avoir pitié de ceulz qui font les grevances et les tors; et plus couvenable chose fust que li accuseur, non pas courrouciéz mais *debonnairez et* piteus, les menassent a jugement, si comme on maine les maladez au mire, pour ce que il retrenchassent les maladiez du pechié par tourment. Et par cest couvenant ou la cure des deffendeurs faudroit toute ou, se elle vouloit miex profiter aus hommes, elle seroit muee en habit de accusacion. Et li mauvais meismes, s'il eussent laisir de regarder a un trou vertu que il ont delaissiee et veissent que il meissent jus les ordurez de leurs vicez par les tourmens des paines, il ne deissent pas pour la recompensacion de aquerir proece que ces paines fussent leurs tourmens et refuseroient l'entente des deffendeurs et se bailleroient touz aus accuseurs et aus jugez. Dont il avient que vers les sagez hommes nus lieus n'est delaissiéz a haine. Car nus ne harroit les bons s'il n'estoit tres foulz; et en hair les mauvais n'a point de raison. Car, aussi comme langueur est maladie de corps, aussi est vicez *et pechiéz* maladie de couragez. Comme nous ne jugeons pas que cil qui sont maladez de corps soient digne de haine, mais miex digne de pitié, moult plus sont digne non mie de estre haiz, mes de estre receus en pitié cil de cui les pensees sont contraintes par felonnesse

---

116 acorderoit: *R* acordoit *DS* accorde.

118 font tort: P^1 tort f. C^2 forfont.

119 oir," dis je: *Rb* (*except* P^3) dis je oir BC^1P^3 oir; raisons: $P^3A^1A^2M$ choses.

120 niez: C^1 neis *D* mes.

122 doubtes: P^1 doubte.

124 dist elle: BC^1DS *om. Rb* (*except DS*) *after* donques.

126 doute: P^1 douteroit C^2 douteroie.

127 auroit: P^1 avoit C^2 a.

128 feseur: BRC^1P^2DS faisieres.

129 du tort . . . receveur: *B om.*; receveur: C^2 recepvours C^1DS receveres RP^2 recevierres.

130 et: *B om.*; racine: *B* raison; l'ordure: *B* laidure.

132-3 de celui . . . certez: A^2 *om.*; de celui qui fait . . . Mais: *B om.*; fait le tort: P^3A^1M le fait.

133 li orateur: *b* (*except* P^3) *om.*; *li accuseur*: *R* et li ac. C^1P^3 *om.*

134 la pitié: *DS* les pites C^1 le pite.

135 *receu*: P^1 receue.

136 grevances: P^1C^2 *om.*

138 menassent: P^1 menacent.

138-9 les maladez au mire (C^1C^2B): *R* les m. a miere P^1 les m. aus mirez A^2DS au mire les m. P^3A^1M aux mires les m. P^2 les mires aus m.

140 couvenant ou: *B* cogneust on; cure: *S* oeure; deffendeurs: P^2 defraudeeurs C^1 deffenderesse.

142 accusacion: *B* excusacion; a un trou: *editor's correction for* aucun pou de (*all mss.; P^1R omit* de C^1 auc. poi devant, *i.e.* de vert).

143 delaissiee: *DS* delaissie *B* de leesce.

145 leurs (P^1; *R* lor): *the rest om.*

146 refuseroient: *DS* si r.; entente: *B* entendement $P^3A^1A^2M$ auctorite; car . . . foulz: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; tres: BC^1P^2DS trop; et: P^1C^2 *om.*

149 maladie: P^1 maladiez.

153-4 felonnesse mauv.: P^1C^2 *inverted M* felonne m.

mauvaistié qui plus est crueuse que nulle langueur de corps *ne puet estre.* (32*ra*)

[METRE IV.]

Pour quoy vous plaist il a hanter si grans esmouvemens *de forsenerie* et esmouvoir et haster la mort par vostre propre main? Se vous queréz la mort, elle se haste de son gré ne ne retarde pas ses isneaus chevaus. Li homme que li serpent et li lion et li tigre et li ours et li senglier requierent aus dens *pour eulz tuer,* toutevois eulz meismes s'entrerequierent a l'espee *pour eulz meismes occirre.* Veéz ci! pour ce que leur meurs sont divers et descordans, il meuvent *entre eulz* contre droiture os et crueusez bataillez et veulent mourir par entrechangier les uns contre les autres *saietes et* gaveloz. Certez la raison de cruauté n'est pas asséz droituriere. Veulz tu *raporter et* rendre guerredon couvenable aus meritez *des hommes?* Aime par droit les bons et aiez pitié des mauvais."

[PROSE V.]

"Ici", dis je, "voi je bien ou quelle beneurté ou quelle maleurté soit establie es meritez des hommes bons et mauvais. Mais en ceste meismes fortune du peuple voi je aucune chose de bien et aucune de mal. Car nulz sages homs ne voudroit miex estre exilliéz, pouvre, *souffreteus,* vilz tenuz *et honteus* que estre demourans en sa cité et fleurir resplendissans de richecez et redoutablez par honneur et fors de puissance. Car ainsi plus clerement et plus loablement est trectiéz *et demenéz* li offices de sapience, quant la beneurté *et la proece* des gouverneurs est aussi comme espandue entre les peuplez voisins *que il ont a gouverner,* et meismement comme *essil,* chartres et lai et cil autre tourment des paines establi- (32*rb*) ez par les lais soient deuz plus aus felons *et mauvais* citeiens pour cui elles furent establiez *que aus bons.* Donques me merveil je trop forment pour quoy ces chosez sont transmueez si diversement que li tourmens *qui doivent cheoir sus les mauvais* appreignent *et confundent* les bons, et li mauvais ravissent les loiers des vertuz *et sont es honneurs et es grans estaz.* Et desire a savoir de toy quelle te semble estre la raison de si torte *et de si desloial* confusion, car je m'en merveillasse moins, se je creusse que toutez chosez fussent

METRE IV.

1 hanter: A^3P^4BR chanter.

2 (esmouvoir) et (P^4): *the rest* a.

3 retarde: P^1 tarde BRP^4 regarde A^3 ne garde; ses: P^1C^2 ces.

4 homme: P^2DS mauves; li serpent . . . senglier (*corrected from* C^1R): P^1: li . . . le . . . le . . . li . . . li sengliers C^2 *throughout* le *sing.* $BP^3A^1A^2M$ *throughout* les *pl.*; senglier: C^1D saingler S sēgler.

5 eulz meismes: P^2DS il m. P^3 eux.

6 veéz ci (P^1C^2): BR vez ci C^1 veschi S vechi D vous chi $P^2A^1A^2M$ vois ci P^3 voy ci.

5-6 pour ce . . . descordans: P^1C^2 *om.*

6 pour ce que (C^1R): P^2 par ce que *the rest* que pour ce que.

7 meuvent: A^3P^4 comuent; *entre eulz*: A^2 a tieulz; os et: *b om.* C^2 osz et B oz et R ols et A^3 oste P^4 ostz.

8 gaveloz ($P^1C^2P^2$): A^3BRP^3M jav. $P^4A^1A^2S$ glav. D gauveles C^1 gaurelos.

10 guerredon: BRP^4 raison A^3 raisons; couvenable: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

10-1 Aime . . . mauvais: DS *om.*

10 droit: P^2 raison.

PROSE V.

1 Ici: C^1DS chi R ice B a ce; ou: DS *om.*; quelle: D que le $SP^3A^1A^2M$ que la; ou q. maleurté: P^2DS *om.* $P^3A^1A^2M$ ou que la m.

2 establie: BD estable; es: DS as $P^3A^1A^2M$ aux.

3 fortune: RDS commune fort. C^1 fort. commune.

4 voudroit: DS ameroit; *souffreteus*: P^3A^1M et s. *b* souf. et.

5 *et honteus*: P^1 *om.*; fleurir: P^3 florissant.

6 ainsi ($C^1P^3A^1A^2M$): *the rest* aussi.

7 loablement (*a*): P^3A^1M loyablement A^2 loyaument P^2DS loialment; trectiéz (traitez): BR retes.

8 *proece*: BR poeste; gouverneurs: B gouvernans.

10 lai: DS lois; des paines: P^3 de loy; establiez: B estables.

11 deuz: A^1 deubs P^3 dehuz.

12 merveil (*a*P^2): *b* (*except* P^2) merveille C^2 mesmerveil.

14 appreignent: R apreímént P^2A^2 appriement P^3A^1M compriment DS apressent C^2 approuvent BC^1 asprement.

17 m'en merveillasse (*a except* B; P^2A^1M): P^3A^2B me m. S mesmerveillasse C^1 men esmerveillaisse; merveillasse: P^1 -ace; moins: B mais $C^1C^2P^3D$ mains; creusse: B veisse.

mellees par fortunieus cas. Mais ores *me comble et* m'acraist mon esbahissement *et ma merveille* diex gouverneur des chosez. Qui comme il doint souvent aus bons *biens et* leesces et aus mauvais *maulz et* asprecez et doint, a l'encontre, aus bons durtéz et aus mauvais otroit *leur volenté et* les chosez que il desirent, quelle difference peut on veoir entre ce que diex fait et les cas de fortune, se on ne cognoist la cause pour quoy ce est?" "N'il n'est pas merveille", dist ele, "se on croit qu'il y ait quelque chose fole et confuse, quant on ne cognoist la raison de l'ordenance de dieu. Mais ja soit ce que tu mescognoissez la cause de si grant ordenance, toutevois pour ce que diex, li bons gouverneur, atrempe *et gouverne* le monde, ne doubte pas que toutez choses n'y soient faitez a droit.

[METRE V.]

Se aucuns ne scet que celle estoille *que on apele* Arctur est tournee par le souverain cardinal prochaine (32*va*) a lui—*c'est au hault pol du firmament*—et ne scet pour quoy Bootes maine tardis ses chars et pour quoy il plunge ses flambez tardivez en la mer, comme il face ses nessemens trop isneaus, il se merveillera de la lai *et de l'establissement* du hault firmament. Et comme les cornes de la lune plaine empalissent *troublees et* entaintez par les bonnes *et par les ombrez* de la nuit oscure, et comme la lune confuse *et oscure* desqueuvre les estoilles qu'elle avoit couvertez par son cler visage, erreur commune en esmeut les gens, *li Coribant en font sonner leurs tabours* et lassent leurs cymbalez d'arein de cos espés.

Nulz homs ne se merveille quant li souffles du *vent que on apele* Chorus batent le rivage de la mer par flot fremissant, ne quant la pesanteur de la neif endurcie par froit est *remise et* dissolue par l'ardant chaleur du soleil, car ici voit on prestement les causez.

Mais la, les causez repostez troublent les pis *des hommes.* Li mouvablez peuples s'esbahist *et se merveille* de toutez les chosez qui aviennent tardivez et soudaines en nostre aage. Mais se la trouble erreur de nostre ignorance se departist de nous, *si que nous seussons les causez pour quoy tiex chosez aviennent,* certainement nous ne verrions jamés merveilles avenir."

---

18 mellees: P^3 meslees C^1 merlees; fortunieus (P^1C^2): BRC^1S -neus *b* (*except S*) -nes (-nez); m'acraist (C^2): P^1 m'atraist *R* me traist C^1PSM me croist A^3 me troist A^1P^3D me croit *B* me occist.

22 difference: *D* deffence.

23 N'il: C^1 *om.* C^2 il.

24 dist ele: C^1 *om.* P^1 dist; qu'il y ait: *B* que i a.

25 mais: C^1 *om.* $P^1C^2RP^3$ mais tu.

28 choses: P^1C^2 *om.*; n'y: BRC^1 ne.

METRE V.

This metre is abridged in A^3 (*It consists of the first sentence followed by a gloss*).

1 Arctur ($P^1C^1RP^2S$): Arttur A^1A^2M Artur P^3 Arture *BD* Actur A^3P^4 Atur; tournee: *D* cournee *S* courue *R* tourmentee.

2 le: P^1C^2 *om.*

3 pour quoy B.: P^1C^2 *inverted*; Bootes (C^1): P^3DSP^4 Boetes A^1A^2M Booetes BRC^2P^2 Boeces P^1 Boece; maine tardis: BP^4 *inverted;* ses (chars): *a* les.

4 flambez: A^1 flambles *D* flamez BP^4 flanges; ses (ness.): P^1C^2 les; nessemens: C^2BR naiss. C^1 viessemens *b* mouvemens.

5 isneaus: *S* ymaus C^1 mals (C^1: en la mer et pour coi il fait viessemens trop mals); la: P^1C^2 *om.*

7 bonnes: P^3 bournes.

9 *Coribant* ($P^1C^1RP^2$): *B* Coribaut C^2 -bauz P^4 Corribault $P^3A^1A^2M$ Coribaux *D* Corbaut *S* Corinbaut; *leurs*: P^2R leur P^3MB les P^4 *om.*

10 lassent (*B; b except DS*): *the rest* laissent (*R* lessent); cymbalez: *R* sinabales; arein (P^1; C^2 arrein): *the rest* arain; cos ($P^1P^2A^1A^2$): P^4 cous P^3MS cops C^1D cols C^2 ses; espés: P^4 espais *DS* d'espees.

11 li: *b* (*except DS*) les; souffles: P^1 souffleis *DS* soufflet.

12 la pesanteur: P^1C^2 *om.* *DS* li pesandeurs.

13 neif: C^1C^2 noif BRP^2P^4 nef P^3A^2DS nege A^1M neige; endurcie: P^2A^1 endurciee A^2 endurce; l'ardant: P^4 la grant.

14 prestement: P^4B appertement *R* apartement.

18 *seussons* (*a except* C^1): C^1 seuíssons P^2 seussiens *DS* sussiemes *the rest* sceussions; *tiex*: C^2 telles.

19 certainement: $P^1C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; verrions ($C^2P^3A^1A^2M$): P^1P^4BR verrons P^2 verriens C^1DS verriemes; merveilles: P^1 *sing.*; avenir: *D* avoir.

[PROSE VI.]

"Ce est voir", dis je, "mais comme tu m'aiez donné *ou promis* a desveloper les repostez causez des chosez et descouvrir les raisons couvertez de occurté, je te pri que tu me devisez de ceste matere et que ce me faces entendre, pour ce que cist miraclez me partrouble trop forment." (32*vb*) Lors dist elle un petit en riant: "Tu m'apelez", dist elle, "a dire chose qui est la tres plus grant de toutez les chosez que on puisse demander, et a qui a paine fu onques fait suffisamment riens de parfaite response. Car la matere est telle que, quant une doubte en est ostee, autres doubtances en craissent sens nombre aussi comme croissoient les testes au serpent que Herculez occist, ne nulle fins n'y sera ja mise, se aucuns ne les contraingnoit par tres vivable feu de pensee *et par vigueur d'engin.* Car en ceste matere seult on faire questions de la simplicité de la pourveane de dieu, de l'ordenance de destinee, des cas soudains, de la cognoissance et de la divine predestinacion et de la franche volenté des hommes, les quiex chosez tu meismes aperçois bien *combien elles sont pesans* et de com grans fais elles sont. Mais pour ce que la cognoissance de ces chosez est une partie de ta medecine, ja soit ce que nous aions pou de temps a ce faire, toutevois nous esforcerons nous a delivrer en aucune chose. Mais se tu te delitez en oir les chançons de musique, il couvient que tu te seuffrez un petit de ce delit, endementiers que je te faiz les raisons enlaciees entreulz par ordre." "Parle", dis je, "si comme il te plaist *ou par chançons ou sens chançons.*"

Lors elle commença sa parole aussi comme d'autre commencement et dist ainsi: "L'engendreure de toutez chosez et touz li avenemens des muablez naturez et tout quenque est meu en quelque maniere que ce soit, tout prent ses causez, son ordre, ses formes de l'estableté de la divine pensee. (33*ra*) Ceste pensee ordenee en la tour—*c'est en la haultece*—de sa simplece establist mainte maniere diverse aus chosez qui sont a faire. Ceste maniere, quant elle est regardee par nous en la purté meismes du devin entendement, est apelee pourveance; mais quant celle maniere est raportee par nous aus chosez que elle meut et ordenne, elle est apelee des anciens destinee. Et legiere chose sera a clerement veoir que ces deus chosez sont diversez entre eulz, se aucuns regarde bien en sa pensee la force *et la proprieté* de l'une et de l'autre. Car pourveance est ycelle meismes

---

PROSE VI.

1 desveloper: $C^1RP^2P^3A^1$ desvoleper *D* desvoler *S* desvoler *par.*

2 repostez: C^1 repuses; des chosez: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

3 ce: P^1 *om.* A^1S te P^3A^2M tu.

4 partrouble: C^1 *pl.* *DS* partourble *R* trouble.

6 tres plus: P^1 *inverted* C^2 plus.

7 a paine . . . fait: P^1 fu onq. fait a p.

8 matere: *B* nature; autres: *B* entre.

8-9 en craissent sens: P^2 encroissans *DS* recroissent s.

9 aussi: *B* ensuíent; croissoient (BC^1DS; P^2 cressoient): P^1C^2R craissent $P^3A^1A^2M$ *after* occist; au serpent: P^1BA^1 *pl.*

10 ja: P^1C^2 james; contraingnoit: *R* constraingnent.

11 tres vivable: P^1 tres suivable C^2 tresuiuable BRC^1P^2 tresmuable.

13 de destinee: P^1C^2 *pl.* *R* de doctrine.

13-4 divine predestinacion: *B* divinite par destinacion P^1 divine p'stinacion.

14 quiex: P^3 quelles C^1 quielles.

15 aperçois ($P^1P^3A^1A^2M$): C^2 apperceis *the rest* aperceus (-cheus); *combien* (P^1C^2): *the rest* comment.

15-6 *pesans* . . . sont: *B om.*; elles sont: *DS om.*

16 de ces: P^1C^2 des.

17 aions (*a except R; DS*): *the rest* avons (P^2 auẽs).

18 en (auc.): *DS* ent $P^3A^1A^2$ *om.* *in M before* delivrer.

19 petit: $C^2P^2A^1A^2M$ petitet P^3 tantet; de ce delit: P^2DS *om.*

20 endementiers: *DS* entrementiers *BM* en dementres; te (faiz): C^1b (*except* P^2DS) t'en; entreulz (*a*): P^2DS en eus $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

21 "parle", dis je: *B om.*; si: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ainsi; plaist: $P^3A^1A^2M$ plaira.

22 commença: P^2DS en c.

23 L'engendreure (*aDS*): P^2 l'angrandeure $P^3A^1A^2M$ la generation.

27 maniere diverse (P^1C^2): *the rest inverted.*

28 regardee: P^3 gardee; la: P^1C^2 *om.*

29 apelee: *B* appareilliee.

29-30 pourveance . . . apelee: A^2 *om.*

29 celle: P^1C^2 telle.

30 aus: *b* en; meut et: C^1 *om.*; et ordenne: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*

31 ces: *B* se.

33 pourveance: *BR* pourvoiance.

divine raison establie ou souverain prince de toutez chosez et celle ordenne toutez chosez; mais destinee est l'ordenance qui *se tient et* se ahert aus chosez mouvablez par la quelle la pourveance lace chascunes chosez en leurs ordrez. Car la pourveance embrace toutez chosez ensemble, ja soit ce que elles soient diversez et sans fin; mais destinee depart et ordenne en mouvement chascunes chosez senglez devisees en lieus, en formez et en temps, si que ceste foraine division de ordenance temporelle amoncelee ou regart de la divine pensee soit apelee pourveance, et cil meismes amoncellemens deviséz et desploiéz en temps soit apeléz destinee. Et ja soit ce que ces chosez soient diversez, toutevois depent *et descent* l'une de l'autre. Car l'ordre destinable vient de la simplece de pourveance. Car si comme li ouvriers, qui aperçoit en pensee la forme de la chose que il veult faire, meut le fait de l'euvre et maine, par ordenances temporiex, ce qu'il avoit avant regardé en sa pensee simplement et presentement, certez ainsi ordenne (33*rb*) diex en sa pourveance singulierement et establement les chosez qui sont a faire, mais il aministre *et baille* en maintez manierez et temporelment par destinee ces meismes chosez que il a ordenees. Donques se destinee est hantee *et acomplie* ou par aucuns esperis devins servans a la divine pourveance, ou par aucune ame ou par toute nature servant a dieu, ou par les celestiaus mouvemens des estoilles ou par aucune vertu des angelz, ou par la diverse sutillité des dyables, ou par aucun de eulz ou par eus touz ensemble est tissue *et acomplie* l'ordenance destinable, certez aperte chose est que ce est la pourveance qui est estable et simple forme des chosez qui sont a faire; mais li mouvables enlacemens et la temporelle ordenance des chosez que la divine simplece *de pourveance* a ordenees a faire, ce est destinee. Dont il s'ensuit que toutez les chosez qui sont sommisez a destinee sont certez sommisez a pourveance a cui destinee meismes est neis sommise, mais aucunez chosez qui sont souz la pourveance seurmontent l'ordenance de destinee. Et ce sont celles qui, establement fichiees, prochaines a la premiere divinité, seurmontent l'ordre de destinable mouvableté. Car aussi comme des cerclez qui se tournent entour un meismes cardinal, cil qui est plus dedens se joint a la simplece du milieu et est aussi comme uns cardinalz des autres cerclez qui se tournent entour lui; et cil qui est plus dehors se tourne par plus grans avironnemens: quant il plus s'esloigne de la moyenne simplece du point, de tant est il desploiéz *et estenduz* par plus largez es- (33*va*) pacez et, s'il est riens qui se enlace et acompaigne a ce milieu, il est contrains de venir en simplece et delaisse a estre espandu et a decourre en diversez partiez—tout aussi et par semblable raison, ce qui se depart plus loing de la premiere pensee *de dieu*, il est

---

34 divine: P^1C^2 *om.*
34-5 et celle . . . chosez: *BR om.*
35 l'ordenance: P^3A^1 l'ordonnance P^1 ordenance.
36. lace: *Rb* enlace *B om.*
36-7 lace . . . pourveance: *B om.*
37 Car la pourveance: *in* P^3 *followed by* icelle meismes divine raison.
39 senglez: *b* seng. et; et (en temps): P^2 *om.*
40 si que: *B om.*; de: $P^3A^1A^2M$ et; amoncelee: P^1C^2R amoncelle.
45 que il: P^1 qui.
46 euvre: P^1C^2 ordre; temporiex (P^1R): C^1C^2D temporels *B* temporeux A^1A^2 tempores *MS* temporelles P^3 temperees.
47 ainsi: *Bb* aussi (*R* aussint).
49-50 mais . . . ordenees: *S om.*
50 ordenees: P^3 destinees.
51 hantee: *B* hautiee.
52 pourveance: $P^3A^1A^2M$ pensee.
52-3 aucune . . . par: *B om.*
53 celestiaus: P^1 cestiaus.
54 angelz (P^1BA^2M): C^1RDS angles C^2P anges P^2A^1 angres; la: *b om.*
54-5 ou par eus: P^1C^2 *om.* *R* ou par.
55 tissue: P^1 traie.
56 forme: *B* souveraine.
59 ce: *b* (*except S*) *om.*; destinee: *D* devisee.
60 destinee sont certez som. a: *B om.*
62 seurmontent: *B* leur monstrent.
63 fichiees: *BR* sont f.; a: $P^1C^2P^2$ en; premiere: P^2DS premeraine; destinable: P^1 estinable.
64 cerclez: P^3 choses; entour: P^2 autour.
65 cardinal: *in* P^3 *followed by* des autres cercles.
71 en (div. par.): P^3 par.

sougiéz a plus grans liens de destinee et, de tant est la chose plus delivre de destinee, de tant comme elle requiert de plus pres ycelui cardinal de toutez chosez. Mais se la chose se ahert a la fermeté de la pensee de dieu et soit sens mouvement *et sens muableté,* certainement elle seurmonte la neccessité *et la mouvableté* de destinee. Donques *itel regart et* telle comparoison comme l'en puet faire de parole a entendement, et de ce qui est engendré a ce qui est, et de temps a eternité et du cercle au point du milieu, aussi puet on *regarder et* comparer l'ordenance de destinee mouvable a l'estable simplece de pourveance.

Celle ordenance muet le ciel et les estoilles et atrempe les elemens entre eulz et les transforme par entrechanjable mutacion; et celle meismes renouvelle les chosez nessans et decheans par semblablez engendreurez de sexes et de semences *de naturez maslez et femeles.* Ceste neis contraint, par enlacemens de causez si fort que riens ne les puet deslacier, les faiz et les fortunes des hommes et, comme ces ordenances viengnent des ourdissemens de pourveance qui n'est pas mouvable, aussi couvient il que elles ne soient pas muablez. Car ainsi sont faitez les chosez tres bien, se la simplece manans en la divine pensee fait (33*vb*) l'ordre des causez qui ne se puet mouvoir de sa nature. Et ceste ordre refraine *et retient* par sa propre estableté les chosez muablez, autrement decourroient elles folement. Dont il avient que, ja soit ce que toutez chosez nous semblent estre confusez et troublees par ce que nous ne poons pas ceste ordre regarder *ne cognoistre,* toutevois leur propre maniere qui les adrece a bien les ordene toutez.

Car il n'est nulle chose qui soit faite par cause de mal; ne ce neis qui est fait par les mauvais hommes *n'est pas fait pour mal.* Et ceulz, si comme nous avons tres planteureusement demonstré, endementiers que il quierent le bien, mauvaise erreur les en destourne, ne li ordres venans du cardinal du souverain bien ne se flechiroit pas en nulle maniere de son commencement. Mais, tu diras, quelle confusion puet estre plus felonnesse de ceste que li bon ont aucune foiz adversitéz et aucune foiz prosperitéz et li mauvais aussi? Vivent donques li homme *si sage et* de telle enterineté de pensee que, quant il jugent aucuns hommes a bons ou a malvais, que il couviengne que cil soient tel comme il cuident? Certez en ce sont contrairez li jugement des hommes, si que *ce que li un loent li autre blasment,* ceulz que li un dient qu'il sont digne de loier, li autre les jugent a dignes de tourment. Mais ottrion que aucuns homs puisse bien *cognoistre et* deviser les bons et les mauvais; pourra il donques cognoistre ycelle reposte atrempance des couragez, si comme on seult parler *des qualitéz et des*

73-4 est la ch. . . . tant: P^2DS *om.*
73 la ch. plus delivre: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aucune ch. plus franche et del.
76 et (soit): P^1C^2 ja A^2 *om.*
77 de: P^1 *om.*; *itel*: *D* ycil $P^3A^1A^2M$ icellui P^1C^2 il te.
79 et (de temps): P^1C^2 *om.*; eternité: *B* estraîte.
83 entrechanjable: *R* autres changables.
84 renouvelle: P^1 nouvelle.
85 *naturez*: *BM* nature P^2 natureus DSC^1 naturels (C^1: semences femieles de naturels malles).
86 riens: *DS* nuls.
87 ces . . . viengnent (*a*): *b* ceste ordenance viegne; ourdissemens: P^2DS hourdi- *B* ordeneement.
88 mouvable: P^1 nouvelle.
88-9 elles . . . muablez (*a*): *b* *sing.*
89 ainsi: $C^2P^1A^2$ aussi (*R* aussint).
90 manans: *B* menans; divine p.: *B* divinite de div. p.
91 ceste (aP^2): $P^3A^1A^2M$ cest *D* cis *S* cilz.
93 ja soit ce que: *B* *om.*
95 ordene: P^1 ordenez.
96 soit faite (P^1); *the rest inverted*; par (P^1C^2): *the rest* pour (*or abbrev.*)
97 ceulz: *DS* tels.
98 quierent: *B* crierent.
99 destourne: P^1C^2 destourbe.
100 se: C^2 les; flechiroit: *R* flechirent *B* flechist.
101 quelle: P^3M que la A^2 que le *D* que li; felonnesse: *M* felonne.
102 li bon: P^1R li bons BC^2P^3M les bons; adversitéz . . . foiz: P^3 *om.*
104 aucuns hommes: P^1C^2 *sing.*
105 soient: P^1 soit; cuident: $P^1C^1C^3$ jugent.
106 *ce que*: P^3A^1M *om.* A^2DS se; *loent*: P^1 loe; *blasment*: P^1 blasme.
107 li un (C^1P^2D): P^1C^2RS li uns *the rest* les uns; qu'il (P^1C^2): A^2 que *the rest* qui; a dignes: P^1 a digne.
108 ottrion (P^1): *the rest* ottroions (P^3 -ens); bien: *b* *om.*; *et deviser*: *B* *om.*
109 et les: *DS* des.

atrempancez des corps? Car ce n'est pas (34*ra*) miracle dessemblable, a celui qui ne le scet, pour quoy aus uns des corps sains sont couvenablez doucez chosez et aus autres sont couvenablez chosez amerez, et aussi des maladez pour quoy aus uns valent medecines legierez et aus autres aigrez? Mais li mirez qui cognoist la maniere et l'atrempance de la santé et de la maladie ne s'en merveille pas. Mais quelle chose semble miex estre salut de couragez que *bontéz et* proece? Et quelle chose semble miex estre maladie de couragez que *malvaistiéz et* vicez? Et quiex autres est ou gardeur des biens ou osteur des malz fors que diex, gouverneur et medecineur des pensees? Que, quant il regarde de la haute eschauguieté de sa pourveance, il cognoist quelle chose couvient a chascun et li preste ce que il li a veu convenir. Or est ici faiz ycil nobles miraclez de l'ordre destinable, quant elle est faite *et gouvernee* de dieu *cognoissant et* sachant dont s'esbahissent cil qui en sont ignorant. Car pour ce que je die briefment de la divine parfondece pou de choses que raison humaine puet comprendre, de celui homme que tu cuidez qu'il soit tres justes et tres gardant de droit, li contrairez en apert a la divine pourveance qui toutez chosez scet; et raconte Lucans, nostre familiers, que la cause vainquerresse avoit pleu aus diex et la cause vaincue plut a Chaton. Donques tout quanque tu vois estre fait en cest monde hors de t'esperance, certainement quant aus chosez, c'est ordres droituriers, mais quant a l'oppinion de toy, c'est parverse confusion. Mais (34*rb*) or posons que aucuns soit plains de si bonnes meurs que li jugemens divins et humains s'acordent ensemble de celui; mais il est enfermez *et foiblez* de courage et, se aucune adversité li avenoit, il laisseroit, espoir, a cultiver innocence par quoy il ne·pot pas retenir fortune. Or espergne donques ainsi la sage dispansacion de dieu a celui que adversité pot *empirier ou* faire pieur, pour ce que elle ne seuffre pas a travaillier celui a cui travaus n'est pas couvenablez. Un autre est parfaiz en toutez vertuz et est sains homs et prochains a dieu; cestui ne veult pas la pourveance de dieu qu'il soit atouchiéz de nulles adversitéz, si que diex ne seufre pas que il soit neis esmeus par corporiex maladiez. Car si comme dit un plus sage par moy: "Certez vertuz ont edefié *et parfait* le corps du saint homme *et li saint homme edefierent leurs corps par vertuz.*" Et souvent avient que la somme des chosez a faire est bailliee a gouverner aus bons pour ce que la malice habondant des mauvais soit *repraınte et* abatue. Et donne diex aus autres prosperité et adversité

---

111 dessemblable: B decevable.

113 aus (autres): P^1C^2 *om.*; sont couvenablez chosez: A^2 *om.*

114 aigrez: P^2DS ameres.

115 la maniere . . . et de: *in* DS *after* couragez (*line* 117).

116-7 salut . . . estre: C^1 *om.*

119-20 gardeur, osteur, gouverneur, medicineur: BRC^1P^2DS garderes, osteres, gouverneres, medecineres (RP^2 -ieres S -erres).

120 Que (quant): B quar Rb (*except* A^2) qui; de (la): P^1C^2 *om.*; haute: P^1 hautece; eschauguieté (P^1C^2): P^2 eschaugiete $BP^3A^1A^2$ eschaugaite RM eschaugete C^1DS escargaite.

121 couvient: BDS il couv.

122 que il li: S qui li P^3M que il y; ici: DS icils; ycil: S ici D icils C^2 cil C^1 cis B iceli P^3 ce A^1A^2M cellui.

124 en sont ignorant: B entre morant.

125 choses (BRC^1S): *the rest* chose; raison (*a*): *b* la r. (DS li r.).

127 a: P^1C^2R en.

128 scet: C^1 sceit C^2 soit; raconte: P^3M racompte BRC^1 raconta; nostre: B vostre; vainquerresse: C^1 vainkeresse P^3 vancheresse DS vengeresse.

129 plut (P^1R): A^1 pleust P^3 avoit pleu *the rest* pleut; Chaton: BR Platon.

129-31 Donques . . . droituriers: *in* S *after* confusion (*line* 132).

129 tout: BRb *om.*

130 de t'esperance: S de te esp. P^3 de ton esp. B de esp. P^1 de desperance.

131 c'est: P^1C^2 est.

132 parverse (*a*): *b* par diverse; Mais or posons: B *om.*

134 enfermez (P^1R): C^1C^2 enferms P^2DS enfers $BP^3A^1A^2M$ enferme.

135 cultiver (P^2DS): A^2 cōtumer *the rest* continuer; pot: A^1DS puet.

137 pot: P^3DS puet; pieur: C^1 peeur C^2 paour R pouour P^3M pire.

140 qu'il: BRP^2 qui; de nulles: C^1P^2DS *sing.* $P^3A^1A^2M$ d'aucune (adversité).

141 que (il) . . . corporiex: $P^3A^1A^2M$ neis qu'il soit esmeus de corporeles.

142 par: $P^3A^1A^2M$ que C^1 de d'(mí); vertuz: P^1 vertez; *et parfait*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*

143-4 *leurs vertuz*: DS *om.*

mellees ensemble selonc la qualité de leurs couragez; et en remort aucuns *par adversitéz* pour ce qu'il ne s'enorgueillissent par longue beneurté, les autres laisse travaillier en chosez durez *et asprez*, pour ce que il conferment les vertuz de leurs couragez par l'usage et par le hanteis de pacience. Li autre craiment plus que il ne doivent ce que il peuent bien porter; li autre despisent plus que droit ce que il (34*va*) ne peuent porter; les autres maine diex en experience de eulz meismes par chosez *aspres* et tristez. Maint autre acheterent *ou deservirent* honorable renomee du siecle par pris de glorieuse mort. Li uns qui ne porent estre vaincuz par tourmens donnerent example aus autres que vertu ne puet estre vaincue par adversitéz. Et de toutez ces chosez n'est nulle doubtance que elles ne soient faitez droitement et ordeneement et au profit de ceulz a cui l'en voit ces chosez avenir. Car, certez, ce que aus mauvais avient aucune foiz adversitéz et aucune foiz prosperitéz, ce vient de ces meismes causez; et des tristecez certez qui leur aviennent ne se merveille nulz, car tuit cuident que il soient de mauvaise merite. Et de ceulz li tourment *sont bon, car il* espoentent les autres de faire les felonniez et amendent ceulz a cui on les fait soufrir; mais neis les prosperitéz *donnees aus mauvais* monstrent grant argument aus bons, quelle chose il doivent jugier de telle beneurté quant il la voient souvent servir aus mauvais. Et en ceste chose croi je que ce est par la dispensacion de dieu, pour ce que par aventure la nature d'aucun est si tresbuchable *en mal* et si engresse que la *souffreteuse* pouvreté de sa maison le pourroit plus anegrir a faire felonniez; a la maladie de cestui met diex remede par donner li richecez. Li autres, regardans la conscience orde de pechiéz et fesans comparoison de soi a sa fortune, craint par aventure que de la beneurté dont li usage li est joieus que la perte ne li en soit dolereuse. Il muera donques (34*vb*) ses meurs, si que, par ce que il craint perdre sa fortune, il delaisse sa felonnie. Aus autres est donnee grant beneurté dont il n'estoient pas digne qui les trebuche *en la mescheance et* en la destruction qu'il ont deservie. Aus uns est *soufferte et* baillie puissance de punir les autres, pour ce que ce soit cause de hanteis *et de acoustumement* aus bons et cause de tourment aus mauvais. Car aussi comme il n'est nulle aliance entre les bons et les mauvais, certez aussi ne se peuent li malvais entre eulz meismes acorder. Pour quoy non, comme chascun mauvais se descordent de eulz meismes par leurs vicez qui detraient leurs consciencez et font souvent maintez chosez, les quiex, quant il les ont faitez, ilz meismes jugent que elles ne deussent pas avoir esté faitez? Dont celle souveraine *divine* pourveance a fait maintez foiz noble miracle: que li mauvais fesoient les mauvais estre bons. Car quant aucun sont veu souffrir les felonnies des

---

147 en (*a*): *b* *om.*
148 s'enorgueillissent: $P^3A^1A^2M$ s'org. P^1C^2 orgueillissent.
149 laisse: *B* laissent; en: *b* aus; pour ce: P^3 afin.
150 le (hanteis): *DS* les P^2A^2M *om.*; hanteis: *B* chanteis A^1 hantis C^1 antise.
151-2 li autre desp. . . . porter: *B* *om.*
153 en (aP^2): *b* (*except* P^2) par; chosez: P^1 ces ch. C^2 ses ch.; Maint autre (*a*): P^3 pluseurs *the rest* maint.
154 *ou*: *b* et.
155 porent: *B* puent; donnerent: *B* donnent.
157 n'est ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* n'est il.
158 ordeneement: P^1 ordenement.
159 aus mauvais: *R* a euls meismes; avient: C^1P^2DS aviennent; adversitéz . . . foiz: P^2C^1 *om.*
160 certez: *DS* *om.*; qui: P^1 qu'il A^2DS que.
161 tuit: *DS* tout P^3 tous.
162 li: P^1 le $BC^2P^3A^1A^2M$ les (tourmens . . bons); espoentent: P^2 espoante.
165 telle (*a*): *b* cele; la voient: C^1DS le v. P^1 avoient.
168 *en* (*mal*): *B* au $P^3A^1A^2M$ a.
169 plus: *b* (*except* P^2) *om.*
170 et: P^1 *om.*: sa: *Bb* *om.*
171 craint: P^1C^2 cr. a sa fortune.
172 joieus: *B* loien; en: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*
173 ce: P^1 se; craint perdre: *R* cuidera pendre *B* cuidera prendre.
174 delaisse sa: *BR* delaissera.
176 deservie (*a*): *b* *om.*
177 cause: P^2 chose *DS* cose; *acoustumement* (P^1C^2): C^1Rb acoustumance *B* continuance.
179 certez . . . malvais: *B* *om.*
183-4 souveraine *divine* pourveance (*a except B*): $P^2DSA^1A^2$ devine souv. p. P^3M div. p. souv. *B* souv. p.
185 felonnies des: *B* *om.*

tres mauvais, il se sont eschaufez en la haine de ceulz qui les punissoient et retournerent au fruit de vertu, quant ilz s'estudierent a estre dessemblablez a ceulz qu'il ont haiz. Car la puissance divine est celle seule puissance a cui li mal sont bon quant elle, en usant convenablement des maulz, en trait le fait *ou le fruit* d'aucun bien. Car uns ordres embrace toutez chosez, si que ce qui se depart de la raison de l'ordre que diex li a assennee toutevois rechiet il en ordre, ja soit ce que ce soit en autre, si que nul- (35*ra*) le chose ne puisse folement aler ou royaume de la pourveance de dieu, *puis que diex li tres fors gouverne toutez chosez en cest monde.* Car il n'est pas chose possible a homme ne de comprendre par engin ne de desploier par parolez toutez les soutivez ordenancez de l'euvre divine. Ce tant seulement li doit sufire a regarder: que diex, feseur de toutez naturez, il meismes ordene toutez chosez et les adrece a bien et, endementiers que il se haste de retenir en sa semblance les chosez qu'il a faites, il chace hors tout mal des termes de sa chose commune par l'ordenance de neccessité destinable. Dont il s'ensuit que, se tu regardes la pourveance ordenant les chosez que on croit qui soient habondans *et outregeusez* es terrez, tu n'y verras en nul lieu nulle chose de mal. Mais je voy ores que tu es ja chargiéz et du faiz de la question et de la longueur de ma parole lasséz, et que tu atens aucune douceur de chançon. Or reçoif donques ce beurage et, quant tu en seras refaiz, tu en seras plus fermes a monter a plus hautez chosez entendre.

[METRE VI.]

Se tu, sages *et preus,* veulz regarder en ta pure pensee les droiturez du hault tonnant, *c'est de dieu,* regarde les hautecez du souverain ciel. Illec gardent les estoilles par droite aliance de chosez leur paix ancienne. Li soleuz esmeuz par son roige fu n'enpeche pas le froit cercle de la lune. Ne l'Ourse qui flechist son ravissable cours entour la souveraine hautece du ciel ne se vet onques laver en la mer de occident, ne n'y couvoite a taindre ses estoilles en regardant que (35*rb*) ces autres estoilles se vont plungier dedens. Hesperus, *ce est l'estoille du soir,* denonce touz jours les tardivez nuiz et Lucifer raporte le cler jour par igalz muancez de temps.

Ainsi refait amour entrechanjable leur pardurable cours; ainsi est mise hors des contrees du ciel bataille descordable. Ceste acordance atrempe par manierez igaulz les elemens, pour ce que les moistez chosez contrairez

---

186 eschauféz: *S* escaufe *D* accuse.
187 retournerent (*a except B*): *B* retoru'ent *S* retornent *the rest* retournoient.
190 le fait (*a except R; DS*): *R* lefet P^2A^2M l'effet P^3A^1 l'effect; *ou le fruit*: P^3 *om.*
192 assennee: C^1b (*except* P^3M) assene *M* assignee P^3 donne P^1C^2 asseuree; rechiet: *R* recoit *DS* rechoit; ordre (*a*): *b* l'ordre.
193 puisse: C^1 poet.
194 *diex*: P^1 die; *en*: P^1 en en.
195 possible: *BS* paisible P^3 loisible A^2 posible; de (comp.): *DS om.* (*twice*).
196 l'euvre: *D* lumiere.
200 tout mal: *B* touz maux.
201 il . . . tu: *B* il ensuit que tu.
202 qui: A^2 que; n'y: *DS* y *B* ne.
203 ores que: P^1 *inverted.*
204 lasséz (*a except* P^1): P^1 laissez *b* lasse.
205 or reçoif: *B* qui recoit.
206 a (plus): P^1 *om.*

METRE VI.

This Metre is omitted in A^3.
2 tonnant: P^1 counant C^2 cõuent P^4 tourment *B* tourmens; *de*: P^1C^2 a *S om.*; regarde: P^4 regarder; (*B after* regarde: les hautes montaignes et); souverain: P^3 hault P^4 hault souv.
3 gardent: P^4B regardent *R* regardant A^2 gardant *M* resgarde; paix (P^1M): P^4 pays C^2R pes *the rest* pais; ancienne: P^1 encienne P^4 en anciāte *DS* anchiennes.
6 vet (P^1R): C^2 vait P^4 vuelt *B* veult *the rest* va; laver: P^4 lever; a taindre: $P^3P^4A^1A^2$ attaindre *RM* ateindre P^1 ataindre.
7 se vont: P^1 le veulent P^4 voit.
8 *soir*: P^4BR jour (*after* soir *in b*: qui).
9 igalz (ingauls, etc.): *M* egales.
10 entrechanjable (*actually*: -iable): C^1 -caníable *BDS* -gable RP^3P^4 -geable A^2 entrechan (*at the end of the line*) uble *M* entretenable; cours: P^4 corps; ainsi: P^4B aussi.
11 acordance: P^1C^2 atrempance C^1 ordenance.
12 manierez: P^4BR muances; moistez chosez: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted*; moistez: P^2 mortes.

aus seiches et les froidez aus chaudez s'entredoignent lieu et s'acordent entre eulz, et que li feus legiers saille en hault et les terrez pesans s'abessent par leurs faiz. Par ces meismes causez rent odeurs au prin temps li ans fleuriz et li chaus estéz en seiche les bléz, et revient autompne pesans de pommez, et pluie decourable en arouse l'iver. Ceste atrempance norrist et aporte toutez chosez qui vivent espirans en cest monde; celle meismes ravist et repont et tost et plunge souz la derreniere mort toutez chosez nees.

Entre ces chosez se siet li hault feseur, roys et sires, fontaine et nessance, lais et sagez jugez de faire droit; et gouverne et flechist les frains *et les retenaus* des choses. Et les choses qu'il esmeut a aler, il les arreste et les retrait de leur mouvement et afferme les chosez foloiables. Car s'il ne rapeloit leur droit mouvement et ne les contrainsist a aler de richief en rondecez flechiez, les chosez qui sont ores contenuez par ordenance estable se departiroient de leur commencement et defaudroient.

Cist est la commune amour a toutez les chosez; et elles requierent toutez estre tenuez par la fin de bien, car autrement ne pourroient elles pas durer, (35*va*) se elles ne revenoient de rechief, par amour retournee, a la cause, *c'est a dieu,* qui leur donna leur estre.

[PROSE VII.]

Vois tu donques quelle chose ensuit toutez les chosez que nous avons ditez?" "Quelle chose est ce?" dis je. "Certez", dist elle, "c'est que toute fortune est bonne." "Et comment", dis je, "puet ce estre fait?" "Or entent", dist elle. "Comme toute fortune, ou joieuse ou aspre, viengne ou par cause de guerredonner ou de hanter *ou de acoustumer et de esprouver* les bons, ou par cause de punir ou de chastier les mauvais, donques est toute fortune bonne, puis que nous sommes certain que elle est ou droituriere ou profitable." "Moult est", dis je, "ceste raison vraie et, se je regarde la pourveance ou la destinee que tu m'enseignas un petit ci devant, ceste sentence est soutenue par fermes fondemens. Mais, s'il te plaist, nombrons la entre celles des quiex tu deis un pou ci devant que elles n'estoient pas cuidablez au peuple." "Et pour quoy", dist elle. "Pour ce que la commune parole des hommes en use mauvaisement et dient communement que la fortune de aucuns est mauvaise."

"Veulz tu donques que nous aprochons un pou aus paroles du peuple, si

---

15 par (P^4BR): *the rest* et par; odeurs (P^2; C^1C^2 oudeurs): P^1DS ondeurs P^3P^4M odeur *R* odour BA^2 oudeur A^1 ondeur; au: $P^1C^2A^2$ en *B* ou *S* et .
16 ans: P^1 an; autompne: *M* antonne.
17 decourable (aP^4): *b* escoulourgable (escaloriable); arouse: P^4 arousant.
18 toutez chosez (P^1C^2R): *DS* les coses *the rest* t. les ch.; vivent: P^4BR viennent; (*after* vivent: toutes *in DS*).
19 repont (*a*): *b* (*except* A^2) repost A^2 rapporte; et tost ($C^1A^1P^4$): P^2 *om.* P^1C^2 et test RP^3 et toult *BAMS* et tolt *D* et taut.
21 se: *b om.*; et (sires): $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*; sires (*from* C^1C^2R): P^1 sire; et (nessance): P^1C^2 *om.* P^4Bb (*except DS*) de.
22 lais (P^1C^2): *the rest* et l.; les frains: $P^1C^1C^2$ *om.*
23 *retenaus* . . . qu'il: P^1C^2 *om.*; *retanaus* (*read* retenans): $P^3A^1A^2M$ retenances; esmeut: *BR* esmeuvent A^2 en suient.
23-5 il les . . . aler: P^3 *om.*
23 les (retrait): *Bb om.*
24 retrait: *R* retient; s'il: P^1C^2 cil.
25 rapeloit: P^4 rappellast; ne (les): P^1C^2 *om.*; contrainsist: A^1A^2M contraignoit.
26 contenuez: P^4B continuees.
27 defaudroient: P^4 deffendroient.
29 estre: C^1b a est.; ne (pourr.): P^1C^2 ne ne.
30 se elles: P^1 sel; par amour: P^4BR pour avoir.

PROSE VII.

1 ensuit: *R* aussint; toutez: P^2 de t.
2 est ce: *b om.*
3 comment: $P^2A^1A^2$ comme C^1 cō.
5-6 guerredonner . . . cause de: *B om.*
5 de (espr.): $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
6 par (P^1P^3): C^2DS *per the rest* pour punir . . . mauvais: P^3 punir les mauvais ou de les chastier.
9 regarde: C^2Bb reg. ou; petit: P^3M pou A^1A^2 po.
11 la: *DS* le P^2 les; des quiex: *B* que diex.
12 Et: C^1b *om.*
13 use: $P^1C^1C^2$ usent.
14 communement: *B om.*

que il ne leur soit pas avis que nous nous soions aussi comme trop departi de l'usage de humanité?" "Si comme il te plaist", dis je. "Ne jugez tu pas donques que ce qui profite soit bon?" "Oy", dis je. "Mais certes celle qui hante ou qui chastie profite." "Je (35*vb*) le recognois", dis je. "Donques est elle bonne?" "Pour quoy non?" "Mais ceste est la fortune de ceulz ou qui sont mis en vertu et bataillent contre les asprecez, ou de ceulz qui eschievent les vicez et se metent ou chemin *de venir* a vertu." "Ce ne puis je", dis je, "nier." "Mais que sera il de la joieuse qui est donnee aus bons en loier et en guerredon? Dit li peuple que elle soit mauvaise?" "Non, ançois juge que elle soit tres bonne, et si est elle." "Et que sera de l'autre que, comme ele soit aspre et refrene les mauvais par droit tourment, cuide li peuple que elle soit bonne?" "Mais de toutez celles", dis je, "que on peut penser, li peuple juge que ceste soit la tres chetive." "Regarde donques que nous, en ensiuant l'oppinion du peuple, ne aions fait ce que nulz ne doit cuidier." "Quelle chose est ce?" dis je. "Certez", dist elle, "des chosez qui sont ottroieez, il couvient que toute la fortune, quelconques elle soit, de ceulz qui sont ou en possession de vertu ou qui sont ou milieu ou qui sont mis ou chemin d'aler a vertu soit bonne, et que toute fortune soit tres mauvaise a ceulz qui demeurent en leurs mauvaistiéz." "C'est voirs", dis je, "ja soit ce que nus homs ne l'ose recognoistre." "Pour quoy", dist elle, "si comme li fors homs ne se doit pas esbahir *ne troubler* toutez les foiz que il ot sonner les trompéz de la bataille, aussi ne doit pas li sagez homs *douloir soy ne* tristement porter toutez les foiz qu'il est amené en l'estrif *de la persecucion* de fortune; car a l'un et a l'autre la griefté meismes leur est matere a l'un de sa glorieuse re- (36*ra*) nommee acroistre et a l'autre de confermer sa sapience *a l'asprece de son estat.* De quoy neis vertuz est apelee qui se soustient si par ses forcez que elle n'est pas seurmontee par adversitéz. Ne vous certez qui estez mis en la hautece de vertu ne venistez pas habonder de delicez ne fletrir en delectacion. Vous faitez en vos couragez aigre bataille *et fort* contre toute fortune, pour ce que la triste ne vous confunde et la joieuse ne vous corrompe. Par fermez forcez tenéz vous ou milieu! Tout quanque est dessouz le milieu et tout quanque vet oultre, il despit beneurté ne il n'a pas loier du travail. Car il est assis en vostre main, *c'est en vostre pooir,* que vous forméz en vous meismes fortune telle comme vous la vouléz miex avoir; car toute fortune qui semble estre aspre, se elle ne hante *les bons* ou chastie *les mauvais,* elle *les* punist *et tourmente ambedeus.*

---

16 aussi comme: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
18 Oy (P^1; *the rest* oil), dis je: B Boece dist oil.
21 asprecez: P^1 ap'tez.
23 donnee: P^2D douce.
24 et: P^1C^2 *om.*
25-6 Et que . . . ele: P^1C^2 *om.*
25 de: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
26 que: R qui.
27 toutez celles: P^1 t. chosez C^1 toute celle.
28 que ceste (*a except* C^1): C^1 quelle *b* que ce; Regarde: $P^3A^1A^2M$ regardons; donques $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
29 en: C^1P^2DS *om.*
30 est ce: *b om.*
32-3 ou en . . . mis: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; (R: ou en p. ou eu milieu . . .).
32 ou milieu ou qui sont: S *om.*; qui (sont mis): BR qui se.
33 a: P^2DS en.
34 leurs mauvaistiéz (P^1C^2B): *the rest sing.*
35 nus: P^1 uns; recognoistre: P^1 cogn.; Pour: A^1A^2 par.
36 se: P^1C^2 *om.*
37 de la bataille: P^2 *om.*
38 *soy* (P^1C^2): *the rest om., but* se *before* doit.
39 griefté: P^1C^2 griefce C^1 griesce B griete P^2 grietez.
41 confermer: $C^1RP^3A^1M$ conformer; *l'asprece* (*a*): *b* la tristece.
42 si: P^1C^2 si que; ses: P^1C^2 ces; pas: $P^1P^2A^1$ *om.* R mie.
43 venistez: B veistes.
44 de: B les; fletrir: B fleschir.
45 couragez: B batailles; aigre bataille (P^1C^2): *the rest pl.* (C^1 estre batailles); triste: P^1 tristece A^1 triste (*with* ce *deleted*).
46 confunde: R connoisse et conf.; ne: P^1C^2 *om.*; vous (corr.): P^1B nous P^3A^2M *om.*
48 ne il (nil): $P^3A^1A^2M$ et; loier: P^3A^1M le l.
49 vostre: $P^1C^2A^1A^2$ nostre; *vostre*: P^1C^2 nostre; vous forméz en vous: B nous auos.
50 miex: *b om.*
51 ne: P^1 *om.*

[METRE VII.]

Agamenon vencheur, qui continua les bataillez par l'espace de dis ans, *recouvra et* apaisa par la destruction de Troye les chambres du mariage son frere qui perduez estoient. Endementiers que cil Agamenon desire donner vailez a la navie grezesche et rachate les vens par le sanc de sa fille, il se met hors de pitié de pere et li doloreus prestrez fait paix et aliance aus diex par la chetive gorge de la pucelle.

Ulixes pleura ses compaignons que il avoit perduz, les quiex Poliphemus li crueus, gisant en sa grant fosse, avoit *mengiéz et* plungiéz en son ventre vuit. Mais toutevois *Poliphemus,* forsenéz (36*rb*) par sa face avuglee, rendi a Ulixes sa joie par les tristez lermez *pleureez pour un seul oil que il avoit en son front que Ulixes li tolli.*

Herculez est celebrablez par ses durs travaulz. Il vainqui les orgueilleus Centaurez. Il ravi la despoille au cruel lion; il feri les oisiaus *Arpians* par certainez saietez. Il ravi les pommes au dragon veillant et fu sa main plus pesant pour le doré metal. Il traina Cerberus, *le portier d'enfer,* o sa trible chaene. Il vainqui Dyomedez le felon et le fist mengier a ses propres crueus chevaus. Il occist *en la palu de Lerne* hidre, *le serpent qui avoit neuf testez,* et en ardi le venim. Achelous li fleuvez enlaidiz de son front *dont Herculez li avoit ostee la corne* plunja son visage honteus dedens ses rivez. Il agravanta Antheus *le geant* es gravellez de Libe; il *estrangla* Cacus *qui avoit mengié le bueus Euander et* apaisa les courrous que Euander en avoit eu. Il leva le senglier escumeus sus les espaulez seur les quiex li hault cielx devoit seoir. Li derrenier de ses travaulz fu que il soustint le ciel seur son col sens flechir et deservi de rechief estre mis ou ciel; ce fu *li pris et* li loiers de son derrenier travail.

Or aléz donques, vous fors hommes, la ou la haulte voie du grant exemple vous maine. Pour quoy estez vous pereceus et vous despoilliéz de vos armes *et vous laissiéz navrer a fortune?* La terre seurmontee donne les estoilles." (36*va*)

METRE VII.

1 vencheur (P^1C^2): $P^3A^1A^2M$ vengeur P^2D vanchieres S vengerres C^1 vanteres A^3P^4BR *om.*

4 navie: BRA^3P^3MDS navire; grezesche (P^1C^2): R gregesche $P^2P^3C^1$ grigoise A^3P^4B gregoise A^1A^2M greioise D grisgoire S grisghoire; rachate (BRA^2M): DS racate $P^2P^3A^1$ rachete P^1C^2 rachatez P^4 rachatant C^1 racata A^3 rachapta; sanc: A^3 sens.

7-10 perduz . . . *il avoit*: B *om.*

8 mengiéz: A^3 devoure P^4 devourez et.

8-9 *mengiéz* . . . vuit: A^3 *om.*

10 *pour* (*a*; B *om.*): $P^2P^3A^3P^4$ par *the rest abbrev.*

13 Centaurez: C^2 tentaures B cantaures R chantaures A^3P^4 septaires; il ravi . . . lion: P^1BR *om.*; feri: D fri C^2 ferit P^2 ravi; *Arpians*: B Arpiaus P^4 arpiaux.

15 metal: $P^3A^1A^2M$ metail; Cerberus: C^1 terberis.

16 le (felon): P^1C^2 li.

17 *palu de L.* ($P^1C^1P^2$): C^2 palu delermes R p. delerme B palu le L. $P^3A^1A^2M$ palude L. S p. de la ra D p. de le ra.

18 Achelous: A^3 achelaux P^4 acelaux B athelons R atelons; li fleuvez: R li felonnes; enlaidiz: C^2 en leidiz P^4R anledis A^3 en lidis BP^3A^1M en laidi A^2 en lardi; son front *dont*: BR son don A^3P^4 son nom; *Herculez*: R herculier.

19 plunja (A^1; P^1C^2 pluma *i.e.* plunia): DS plonja M plungea P^4 plongia *the rest* plunga (A^2 plonga).

20 agravanta (P^1; C^2 aggraventa): *the rest* acraventa; Antheus: R atheus; *le geant* . . . Cacus: B *om.*; *geant*: A^3P^4R grant; Cacus: P^1C^2R tacus P^2D catus A^3 tucus P^4 cucus B *om.*

21 *bueus* (P^1): P^2A^1 bues R beuz P^3A^2M buefs DS boes BC^1 biens C^2 neueuz A^3P^4 *om.*; Euander: D en auder; les: P^1 le; *et* apaisa . . . Euan.: A^3P^4 *om.*

22 escumeus ($P^1C^1C^2$): R escoumeus B escõmeuz P^4 escommeux A^3b *om.*

23 seoir: A^1 seer R souair.

24 ou: P^4R en; ce (fu): P^4BR et.

26 grant: P^1C^2 hault.

27 estez . . . et: A^3P^4 *om.*

28 armes: P^1P^2 ames.

28-9 La . . . estoilles: P^2DS *om.*

[BOOK V.]

[PROSE I.]

Ce avoit elle dit et tournoit le cours de sa parole a traitier et a despechier aucunes autres chosez. Lors dis je: “Certez droituriers est li tiens amonnestemens et tres dignes par l’auctorité de toy, mais ce que tu deis jadis que la question de la divine pourveance est enlaciee de pluseurs autres questions, je *l’entens bien et* le preuve par celle chose meismes. Or te demant, savoir mon, se tu cuidez que cas soit du tout aucune chose et, *se tu le cuidez, je te demant* quel chose ce est.” Lors dist elle: “Je me haste de rendre toi la debte de ma promesse—c’est de toi monstrer la voie par quoy tu reviengnes en ton pais. Mais, ja soit ce que les chosez que tu me demandez soient moult profitablez a cognoistre, toutevois sont elles un petit diversez *et estranges* du sentier de nostre propons, et me doubt que tu ne soiez si las par ces desvoiabletéz que tu ne puissez pas suffire a mesurer *et a appareillier* droit chemin.” “N’en doubte”, dis je, “de nulle riens. Car *oir et* cognoistre les chosez de quoy je me delite plus, ce me aura esté en lieu de repons, puis que je ne douterai jamés nulle des chosez ensuivans, quant toutez les parties de ta desputaison m’auront esté descouvertes par certaine foy.”

Lors dist elle: “Ce te ferai je voulentiers” et commença lors ainsi a parler: “Certez”, dist elle, “se aucuns defenist cas en telle maniere que ce soit (36*vb*) avenemens amenéz par fol mouvement sens nul enlacement de causez, je conferme que cas est du tout niant et juge que c’est du tout vois vaine sens nulle significacion de chose sommise *a celle vois*. Car quiex lieus puet estre demourans a folie *et a desordenance*, puis que dieu maine toutez chosez en ordre? Car nulle chose n’est faite de niant. Ceste sentence est vraie a cui nulz des anciens ne contredeist onques, ja soit ce que ce n’entendissent il pas de *dieu qui est commencement et* premiers ouvrans, mais il geterent aussi comme un fondement du sugét material, c’est a dire de la nature de toutez chosez faitez par raison. Et se aucune chose nest de nulles causez, il semblera que celle chose soit nee de niant. Mais se ce ne puet estre fait, donques n’est ce pas possible que cas soit nulle chose telle comme nous avons defeni un pou ci devant.”

“Quelle chose sera ce donques?” dis je. “N’est il donques nulle chose qui par droit puisse estre apelee ou cas ou aventure de fortune? Et est il riens, ja soit ce que li peuples ne le cognoisse pas, a cui cist mot soient couvenable?” “Li miens Aristotez”, dist elle, “ou livre de Phisique defeni

---

1 despechier (C^2P^3M): P^1A^2 despecier A^1 despeschier C^1RP^2DS despeechier B despeescher.
2 dis je: P^1 *inverted*.
3 l’auctorité: D le nature.
5 *et* le . . . meismes: B *om.*; demant (*aS*): *the rest* d. je.
5-6 savoir mon: *b om.*
6 que: P^1 que que.
7 chose: DS ch. meismes; haste: *Rb* h. dist elle; rendre toi (P^1C^2): *the rest inverted* (P^2S te r.).
8 debte: P^1C^2 deste R deite B deserte.
8-9 par . . . revieng.: B *om.*; reviengnes: A^2 viengnes D remaignes.
9 en: B de.
10 sont elles: P^1C^2 *inverted*.
11 sentier: P^1 sentir; ne (soiez) (P^3DS): *the rest om.*
12 ces: P^2DS tes B ses; puissez: B pues; suffire: $P^3A^1A^2M$ souffirir.
13 *appareillier* (P^3C^2B): C^1P^2DS par aler $RP^3A^1A^2M$ parler; droit: B ton dr. C^1 a ton dr.; N’en: BR je n’en.
15 repons (P^1): *the rest* repos; douterai: *a* (*except* C^1) douteroie M doubte; ensuivans: P^1 ensuivant.
16 auront (S aueront B aront): P^1 auroit; descouvertes: P^1 *sing.*
18 ferai: C^1 feroi B dirai; lors ainsi: *b* (*except M*) *inverted* C^1 ainsi.
23 *desordenance* (*a*; P^1 -se C^1 -ces): *b* descordance.
24 chosez: DS ces ch.
24-5 Car . . . onques: P^2 *om.*
25 anciens: B autres; contredeist (P^1): *the rest* -dist.
28 faitez par raison: P^2 *om.*; chose: *a om.*
29-30 soit . . . chose: P^3 *om.*
30 cas: P^1 quas; nulle chose telle: B telle ch. A^2 nulle ch. que t.
33 et est il: P^1C^2 y est il A^2 et il.
34 le: P^1 *om.*

ceste chose par raison brieve et prochaine a verité." "En quele maniere?" dis je. "Toutez les foiz", dist elle, "que on fait aucune chose par grace de aucune autre chose, et aucune autre chose que celle que on entendoit avient par aucunes causes, c'est apeléz cas, si comme se aucuns foait la terre pour cause de cultiver le champ et trouvast illeques une masse d'or enfoie. Or cuide on don- (37*ra*) ques que ce soit avenu par cas fortunel, mais ce n'est pas de niant; car ce a ses propres causez des quiex li cours *et li assemblemens* despourveuz et non-cuidiéz samble avoir cas fait. Car se li coutiveur du champ ne foist la terre et se li reponieur *de l'or* n'eust en ce lieu son or repost, li ors n'eust pas esté trouvéz. Ce sont donques les causez de l'abregement du cas fortunel qui est avenus par causez qui s'entrencontrerent et coururent ensemble, non mie par l'entencion du feseur. Car, ne cil qui l'or repost ne cil qui le champ foi n'entendirent pas que li ors fust trouvéz; mais, si comme je ai dit, il avint et courut ensemble que cil foi la ou l'autre ot l'or repost. Or poons donques ainsi defenir cas: cas est avenemens nommie cuidiéz de causez assemblees sens l'entencion des feseurs; mais cil ordrez, alans par conjunction qui n'est pas eschevable, descendans de la fontaine de pourveance qui ordene toutez chosez en leurs lieus et en leurs temps, fait les causez courre et avenir ensemble.

[METRE I.]

Es broçons de la roiche Eschimenienne, la ou la fuitive bataille *des Turs getent et* fichent leurs javeloz retournéz es piz de ceulz qui les suivent, *dui fleuve, c'est a savoir* Tigres et Eufratez, descendent d'une fontaine et, tantost, desjoignent leurs eaues et se departent. S'il se assemblent puis et reviennent de richief en un cours, queurt illec avec eulz ce que li uns et li autres fleuves aporte. Les naves et li tronc arrachié se assembleront ou fleuve, et les eaues mellees y feront moult de cas fortunex; et toutevois li be- (37*rb*) stourneis de la terre et li decourables ordres du fleuve escou-

---

36 quele: P^1 quelque C^1DS quel.
38 autre chose: P^1C^2 *inverted.*
39 par auc. causes: P^1C^2 *om.*; foait (P^1C^2): C^1b fouoit (P^3 fouait) R fols ait B fol leur fouoit.
40 cause de: b *om.*; cultiver ($C^1P^2A^2M$): P^3S coultiver RA^1 coutiver P^1C^2BD continuer; illeques (P^1R): P^2C^1 illuec DS illoec *the rest* illec; masse: P^2DS fosse.
42 ce (*a*; R se): P^2DS *om.* $P^3A^1A^2M$ il; a ses: A^1 est a ses R asses; des quiex: P^3 que B des; cours: B corps.
43 et (non-cuid.): P^1C^2 *om.*; cas fait: C^1Rb (*except S*) *inverted*; coutiveur: C^1DS coutiveres (coul-) P^2R -ieres.
44 foist (P^1C^2): A^2 eust fouy *the rest* fouist; reponieur (P^1C^2): C^1DS reponneres RP^2 -ieres *the rest* reponneur; *l'or*: C^2 lour.
45 repost: C^1 repus; n'eust pas: b n'i eust p.
46-7 s'entrencontrerent: P^2DS s'en entrecon. R s'en encontrerent B s'en entre encontrerent P^1 s'entrecontrent.
47 coururent: P^1 couturent.
48 entendirent (*a*): b entendoient; que: P^1 qui.
49 foi la: b foi la terre.
50 l'autre ot l'or repost (*according to* A^2 *and Chaucer*): BRb (*except* A^2) ou cil ot l'or repos (repost, repus, repuns) C^1 ou chil l'or repust P^1C^2 ou l'or fu repost (A^2: *precisely*: ou l'autre (*with* est *deleted*) ot l'or respot).
52 cil: P^1 *om.*
53 fontaine: DS font. neis.
54 lieus: R liēs.

METRE I.

1 broçons: C^1RDS brochons C^2 broczons A^3 bracons; roiche (P^1): *the rest* roche; Eschimenienne (P^1C^2): $P^3A^1A^2MP^4$ Achimemaine A^3 Achimemanye B Achememanne R Achimenianne C^1 Atimemaime D Achimemaime P^2S Archimeniaine.
2 *getent*: A^3 gectant P^4 gettens; fichent: A^3P^4 fichans; javeloz: A^3 gavelos P^4S glaveloz C^1 gaurelos D gaūlos; es piz: C^1 espres; suivent: b ensuivent.
3 desjoignent: P^1 desjoignait A^3P^4BR se joingnent.
4 S'il: $BRP^3A^1A^2M$ si A^3P^4 et; se (ass.): C^1D *om.*; assemblent: A^3P^4BR rassemblent; et: P^2DS *om.*
5 reviennent: b viennent P^4B remuent A^3 se remuent; richief (P^1): *the rest* rechief; queurt ($C^2P^3A^2M$): C^1 quert P^1 et queure A^1 keure R queurent A^3D cueure S coeure P^2 ceuure P^4B cueuvre; avec eulz: P^4B en e. A^3 *om.*
6 naves: P^3M nefs A^1 nes A^2 nez; li tronc: P^4 li throncs R litrontq B li trōs; arrachié: B a roche A^3 a roiches; assembleront: P^1C^2 assemblerent.
7 feront: S font D ft'.
8 bestourneis: B betourneis R bertourneis P^4 bertonnes P^2 betournez (A^2: les betourne la terre); decourables: P^1C^2 descordables A^2 de bourable.
8-9 du fleuve escoulorjant: B fu fremíe

lorjant gouverne touz ces foloiablez cas. Ainsi Fortune de cui il nous semble que elle flote a frains habandonnéz *et laschéz est bien gouvernee et* seuffre frains et trespasse par la loy *de l'ordenance de dieu.*"

[PROSE II.]

"Ce entens je bien", dis je, "et m'acort qu'il soit ainsi comme tu dis. Mais je te demant, savoir mon, se en ceste ordenance de causez qui s'entretiennent, s'il y a aucune franchise de nostre volenté ou, savoir mon, se la destinable chaene contraint aussi les esmouvemens de couragez humains."

"Certes", dist elle, "franchise de nostre volenté est, car oncques ne fu ne ja ne sera nulle raisonnable nature que franchise de arbitre *et de election* ne soit en lui. Car ce qui puet naturelment user de raison, ce a jugement par quoy il cognoist *et devise* toutez chosez *bonnes et males;* or cognoist il donques par soi les chosez qui sont a fuir et celles qui sont a desirer. Et ce que chascuns juge a desirer, ce requiert il et fuit ce que il cuide qu'il soit a fuir. Par quoy en toutez les chosez ou raison est, en eulz est franchise de vouloir ou de non vouloir. Mais je ne ottroi pas que elle soit igaulment en toutez. Car es sustances souveraines et devines, *c'est es esperiz,* jugemens y est plus clers et volenté nommie corrompue et puissance preste de faire ce que il desirent. Mais les ames humaines couvient il que elles soient plus franchez quant elles se gardent ou regart de la divine pensee, et moins franchez (37*va*) quant elles descendent es corps, et moins encores quant elles sont enlaciees *et comprisez* des membres terriens. Mes la derreniere *et la peeur* servitude est quant elles sont abandonnees aus vicez et sont cheues de la possession de leur propre raison. Car puis que elles ont *destournéz et* degetéz leurs yeulz de la clarté de la souveraine verité aus chosez plus bassez, *mondaines* et tenebreusez, tantost elles sont avuglees par l'occurté d'ignorance *et de folie* et sont troublees *par deliz et* par destruiables entalentemens et, quant elles s'en aprochent et s'i acordent, elles aident *a acraistre* la servitude qu'elles ont aportee seur eulz meismes et sont en ceste maniere chetivez *et estrangiees* de leur propre franchise. Et toutevois ces chosez voit cil regars de la divine pourveance qui toutez chosez regarde de touz jours, et les ordenne chascunes en leurs meritez, si comme elles sont devant destinees.

[METRE II.]

Homers qui si doucement chanta que on dit qu'il ot bouche de miel dit que li soleus est clers de pure lumiere *seur toutez autres clartéz.* Et toutevois

---

entour leur genz A^3P^4 ne sueffre mie entour leur gens; escoulorjant (*more precisely* -loriant, P^1C^2): *D* escoulourghant C^1RP^2 escoulourgant $P^3A^1A^2M$ escaloriant *S* escoulourgable A^3P^4B entour leur gens.

9 foloiablez cas: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted* A^3P^4 foliables c.

10 elle flote: A^3P^4 les floz *R* li flo *B* le fol; *et laschéz* (*a except B*): *B* a l. *b* (*except DS*) a lasches resnes *DS* et lasche regnes; *est:* P^1 et.

PROSE II.

1 Ce . . . acort: *DS* ce (*S* se) accorc je bien enten dis je et me accort.

3 se: P^1C^2 de.

9 fuir: P^1 fouir.

9 celles: $P^3A^1A^2M$ les choses.

9-10 Et ce . . . desirer: *B om.*

9-11 et celles . . . fuir: *R om.*

10 qu'il (*a except* C^1): $C^1P^2SA^1M$ qui P^3A^2 que.

11 Par (*a*; C^1 per): *b* pour (por); en eulz est: *b* est en e.

12 ou de non voul.: *a* (*except* C^1) *om.*; ottroi: *R* croi.

13 *es* (esperiz): BRP^2 *om.*

14 y est: *R om.*

17 et moins encores: B *om.*

19 *peeur* (*editor's correction for* pee *from* P^1C^2): P^3M pire C^1R piour *the rest* pieur; cheues: *B* cheuees *M* seurees A^2 dēnees.

22-3 par l'occ. . . . troublees: P^1C^2 *om.*; destruiables: P^1 destrivables C^2DS destinablez.

26 *estrangiees* (P^1; C^2 estrangies): *the rest* estranges.

27 cil (*a*; *B* ce): P^2DS li P^3A^1M le A^2 la; qui (C^1BRP^3DS): P^1P^2 que *the rest abbrev.*

27-8 regarde . . . jours: P^1C^2 de t. jours r. C^1M reg. t. j. A^2 reg. en tous temps.

METRE II.

1 chanta: *D* chante.

ne puet il pas par la clarté de ses rais rompre les repostez antraillez de la terre ne la parfondece de la mer. Ainsi ne voit pas *diex,* li feseur du grant monde; a cestui qui de hault regarde toutez chosez ne contrestent les terres par nulle pesanteur, nulle nuit ne li contreste par ses occures nuez. Cist voit en un moment de pensee toutez les chosez qui sont et qui furent et qui avendront. Et cestui (37*vb*) pour ce qu'il regarde toutez chosez seus, peuz tu bien dire que cist est li vrais soleuz."

[PROSE III.]

Lors dis je: "Or sui je", dis je, "confonduz par plus greveuse doubtance *que devant.*" "Quelle doubtance est ce?" dist elle. "Car je aperçoif ja par quiex chosez tu es troubléz."

"Trop me semble", dis je, "grant contraireté et grant descordance que diex sache toutez chosez avant que elles aviengnent et que aucun arbitre de franchise puisse demourer. Car se diex regarde toutez chosez avant, n'il ne puet en nulle maniere estre deceus, donques couvient il que tout aviengne quanque la pourveance de dieu a devant veu qui avendra. Par quoy, se diex scet avant et de touz jours nommie seulement les faiz des hommes mais neis leurs conseuz et leurs volentéz, nulle franchise de arbitre ne sera; car nul autre fait ne nulle autre volenté ne pourra jamés estre, fors que celle que la divine pourveance qui deceue ne puet estre a sentue devent. Car se elles peuent estre destortes *et* autrement *avenir* que elles ne sont pourveues *de dieu,* ce ne sera ja pas ferme prescience des chosez a avenir, ainçois sera miex opinion *et cuidance doubteuse* sens certaineté; et ce croire de dieu, ce juge je a grant felonnie. Car ne celle raison neis ne loe je pas par quoy aucuns croient que il puissent soudre *et deslier* le neu de ceste question. Car il dient que la chose n'est pas a avenir pour ce que la pourveance a veu devant que elle avendra, mais li contrairez est mieus; c'est pour ce que la chose est a avenir, pour ce ne la (38*ra*) puet la divine pourveance mescognoistre *et que pour ce la scet diex avant.* Et en ceste maniere ceste neccessité rechiet en la contraire partie *et vient des chosez en dieu,* car il dient qu'il ne couvient pas que les chosez aviengnent qui sont pourveuez, mais il couvient que les chosez qui sont a avenir soient pourveuez—aussi comme se nous travaillons a enquerre la quelle chose soit cause de la quelle, c'est assavoir ou se la prescience est cause de la neccessité des chosez a avenir, ou se la neccessité des chosez a avenir est cause de la

---

3 puet: $C^1C^2P^3$ pot *R* peust; ses: P^1 ces.
4 Ainsi ne voit pas: A^3P^4B aussi voit.
5 contrestent: *b* c. pas (A^3P^4 non contrestant).
6 nulle (pes.): P^4 leur; nulle nuit: P^4 n. nue A^3 nulles nues; contreste: P^1C^2 contrestes; nuez: A^3 nuees P^4 nublesces.
7 qui sont et qui furent: C^1DSA^3 *om.* et P^1 qui f. et qui s.
8 cestui: *DS om.*; pour ce: $P^3A^1A^2M$ puis; regarde: A^3P^4 te r.; seus ($P^1C^1C^2P^2$): $P^3A^1A^2M$ seul *DS* seuls P^4BR sceues.
9 dire: *R* dierre P^4 savoir.

PROSE III.

1 greveuse: P^3A^2 griefve A^1M grieve.
2 je aperçoif: *DS* je me ap. A^2 ia par coy *B* ap. je.
2-3 par quiex chosez: *B* pour quelle chose.
4 contraireté (P^1): C^1C^2B contrariete *Rb* contraire.
6 toutez: $P^3A^1A^2M$ de t.
8 avendra: *S* averra; Par: P^2DS pour BC^1M *abbrev.*
10 conseuz: *S* consauls *D* causes; ne: *B* ni.
11 nulle: P^2DSF^2 *om.*; pourra (*a*): *b* puet (poet).
12 sentue: $P^3A^1A^2M$ sceue; devent (P^1): C^2 davant *the rest* devant.
13 peuent (puent): *B* pooient; estre destortes: A^2 e. destorbees *B* destourner.
14 ja pas (C^2): P^1 ja par C^1 pas RA^2 ja *Bb* (*except* A^2) pas ja; prescience: *B* pacience; des chosez ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest sing.*
15 *et* (*cuid.*): *b* de; cuidance: P^1 cuidiance; *doubteuse*: *R* doubtance; ce croire: P^2DSF^2 de ce cr.
16 felonnie: P^1C^2 folie.
17 soudre (soldre): C^1 sourdre *DS* saurre A^1 solder.
19 c'est: P^1 c'est que.
24 aussi: mais *preceding* aussi *in all mss. is suppressed by the editor.*
25 se: C^2b *om.*; travaillons: *R* travaillions; enquerre (BC^1b; MF^2 a enquerir): *R* a anquierrre P^1C^2 en aquerre.
25-6 la quelle . . . quelle: P^3 la chose de la quelle soit cause.
25 chose: *DS* cause.

pourveance. Mais a ce demonstrer ne nous esforçons nous pas ore que, comment que se port li ordres des causez, il couvient que li avenemens des chosez devant seues soit neccessairez, neis se il ne semble pas que la prescience mete nulle neccessité de avenir es chosez qui avendront. Car certez se aucuns se siet, il couvient par neccessité que l'oppinion de celui qui cuide que cil se siee soit vraie; et de rechief aussi est il du contraire: se l'oppinion d'aucun est vraie pour ce que il se siet, il couvient par neccessité que il se siee. Donques est ici neccessité en l'un et en l'autre, car en l'un est neccessité de seoir et en l'autre est neccessité de verité. Mais pour ce ne se siet pas chascuns pour ce que l'oppinion de celui seoir est vraie, mais l'oppinion est mieus vraie pour ce que aucuns se sist avant. Et ainsi, comme la cause de la verité viengne de l'autre partie, toutevois est en l'un et en l'autre commune neccessité. Aussi poons nous faire nos rai- (38*rb*) sons de la pourveance et des chosez a avenir. Car neis se pour ce que les choses sont a avenir pour ce sont elles pourveues, et nommie pour ce que elles sont pourveues pour ce n'aviennent elles pas, toutevois couvient il par neccessité ou que les chosez a avenir soient pourveues de dieu, ou que les chosez pourveues de dieu aviengnent par neccessité; et ceste seule chose suffist asséz a destruire la franchise de nostre arbitre, *c'est de nostre jugement ou de nostre volenté.* Mais or apert il bien comment la chose est *bestournee et* mise ce devant derrierez que nous dions que li avenemens des chosez temporiex est cause de la pardurable prescience. Mais cuidier que diex pourvoit les chosez qui sont a avenir pour ce que elles sont a avenir, quelle autre chose est ce que cuidier que les chosez qui jadis avindrent sont cause de celle souveraine pourveance *qui est en dieu?* A ce ajuste je encores que aussi comme quant je sai que aucune chose est, il couvient par neccessité que celle chose soit, aussi quant je ai seu que aucune chose avendra, aussi couvient il par neccessité que celle chose aviengne. Ainsi s'ensuit il donques que li avenemens de la chose devant seue ne puisse estre eschevéz. Au derrenier, se aucuns cuide aucune chose estre autrement que elle ne est, ce n'est pas tant seulement non-science, ainçois est opinion decevable moult diverse de la verité de science. Par quoy se aucune chose est ainsi a avenir, si que li avenemens de li ne soit pas certains ne neccessairez, comment pourra il avant estre seu que celle chose avendra? (38*va*) Car aussi comme science ne puet estre mellee a fausseté, aussi ce qui est par science conceu ne puet estre autrement que si comme il est conceu. Car c'est la cause par quoy science ne reçoit pas mençonge, car il couvient par neccessité que chascune chose soit ainsi comme science la comprent a estre. Que dirons nous donques? En quel

28 demonstrer: *R* monstrer: esforçons (*b except* P^2): P^2*a* efforcerons (*R* -on).
32 pas ore ($P^1C^1C^2$): *b inverted* (A^2 oir pas) *R* ore mie *B* ore; (ore) que (*editor's correction*): *b* car *a om.*
29 port (P^1C^2): *the rest* porte.
31 mete: *S* meche *B* mettent; avenir: BC^2 venir *D* avoir.
32-3 celui qui cuide: P^1C^2 celui cuidier C^1 cestui cuide.
33 que cil se siee: DSA^1A^2M qu'il se s. P^3 estre assiz; siee: F^2 see C^1 siece.
34 d'aucun est vraie ($P^1C^2A^2$): *the rest* est v. d'auc.
36 de seoir: *D* a s. *R* de soier.
37 celui (*b*; P^2P^3 celi): P^1C^2R l'un BC^1 lui; seoir: *R* souair C^2 soair.
38 mais . . . vraie: *B om.*; sist: *B* siet.
39 ainsi (C^1RP^3): *the rest* aussi.
40 commune: P^1R comme; nous: P^1 nos.
41-2 Car . . . avenir: P^1C^2 *om.*
42 avenir: BA^1A^2 venir.
42. 43 pourveues: P^1C^2 prouvees.
42-3 et nommie . . . pourveues: *DS om.*
43 pas: *DS followed by* que elles sont pourveuez.
46 seule chose: *DS inverted;* destruire: *D* destinee.
48 *bestournee*: *R* bonneuree *B* beneuree; dions ($BP^3A^1A^2$): P^2F^2 diens C^1D dijens *R* disons *S* diriens P^1C^2M (*erasure*) deismes.
50 pourvoit: A^1 porveoit; qui sont: *b om.*
51 quelle: P^1C^2 que; que (cuidier): *b* fors que.
53 que (aussi): *S* car; que . . . sai que: *B om.*; aussi: P^1 ainsi.
54 quant: P^1C^2 comme.
56 Ainsi: $P^1C^2BP^2F^2$ aussi.
60 Par: *BRDS* pour; de li: C^2 de le P^1 d'elle $P^3A^1A^2M$ de lui.
61 avant estre: $BC^1P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted.*
65 chose: P^1C^2 *om.*

maniere cognoist avant diex ces chosez a avenir se elles ne sont pas certaines? Car s'il scet que elles avendront non eschevablement et puet estre que elles n'avendront pas, il est deceuz; mais *de dieu* nommie tant seulement ce croire *que il soit deceuz,* mais neis dire le de bouche, c'est felons pechiéz. Mais se diex scet que, si comme les chosez sont a avenir, ainsi avendront elles, si que il sache igaulment queles chosez peuent ou estre faitez ou non estre faitez, quelle est ceste prescience qui ne comprent nulle chose certaine ne nulle chose estable? Ou quelle difference a il entre ce et celle rude devinaille de Tyresie *le devineur qui dist:* "Quanque je dirai, ou il sera ou il ne sera pas"? Ou combien neis vaudra mieux la divine prescience de l'oppinion humaine, se elle juge aussi comme li homme les chosez non-certaines des quiex li avenemens n'est pas certains? Mais se nulle chose non-certaine ne puet estre en celui qui est fontaine tres certaine de toutez chosez, donques est certains li avenement des chosez que il a fermement avant seu que elles avendront. Par quoy il s'ensuit que la franchise des conseuz et des euvrez humaines est nulle, puis que la pensee de dieu (38*vb*) qui toutez chosez voit sens erreur de fausseté les lie et contraint a un avenement *par neccessité.* Et se ce est une foiz receu *et ottroié,* il apert *com grans deffaulz et* com grans domagez des choses humainez s'en ensuivent. Car pour niant sont propouséz loiers et paines aus bons et aus malvais, puis que nulz mouvemens de couragez frans et volenterins ne les a pas deserviz. Et semblera que celle chose soit tres felonnesse qui est ore jugiee pour tres droituriere, ce est a savoir que li mauvais soient puni et li bons soient guerredonné, puis que leur propre volenté ne les envoie pas ne a l'un ne a l'autre, *c'est a dire ne a bien ne a mal,* ainçois les y constraint certaine neccessité de chose a avenir. Donques ne seront jamais *ne onques ne furent* ne vicez ne vertuz, ains sera mieux confusion de toutez les meritez mellees sens discrepcion. Et encores *s'ensuit autre descouvenue* de la quelle nule chose plus felonnesse ne puet estre pansee, c'est que, comme touz li ordres des chosez viengne de la pourveance *de dieu* et que li conseil humain n'ont pooir de riens valoir, il s'ensuit que nos vicez meismes soient raportéz au feseur de touz biens, *puis que il nous contraint a faire les maulz.* Donques n'avons nous nulle raison de avoir esperance *en dieu* ne de *dieu* prier. Car pour quoi espereroit chascuns ou pour quoi prieroit il, puis que l'ordenance des destinees qui ne puet estre flechiee enlace *et contient*

---

67 avant: P^1 *om.*; (BP^3 cog. diex avant); ces: P^1C^2 les.

69-70 *de dieu* . . . neis: *B om.*

70 ce croire: P^1 *om.*; bouche: *S* bouce *D* bonte; c'est: *BR* ses.

71 que: P^1C^2B *om.*

72 sache: *S* saice P^3 saiche *D* seche C^1 soit; queles: A^1 quelles les P^3 que quelles; ou (estre) ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest om.*

73 estre: $BRP^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; chose: P^1C^2 *om.*

76 pas (*a except R*): *the rest* mie.

77 comme li homme: $P^3A^1A^2MF^2$ *om. DS* comme.

77-8 non-certaines: P^3 incertaines.

78 des . . . certains: *D om.*; des quiex: *B* de quoy.

79 celui: P^2 celi P^1C^2 celle.

80 a fermement: P^3S afferment.

81 seu: *R* seues *B* ce.

83 chosez: P^1 *om.*; les lie: P^2DS deslie.

85 *grans* . . . domagez: *b* grant deffaut . . . grant dommage.

85-6 *et* com . . . ensuivent: *BR om.* (*they read instead: R* doumages humainnes sensiue *B* de muages humaines).

85 choses: P^1 *om.*

86 ensuivent: RP^2P^3S ansive (en-, ensieve) C^1 ensíut.

86-7 propouséz . . . malvais ($P^1C^1C^2$): *BR* proposes et promis l. et p. . . . P^2 propousez loiers aus b. et paines aus m. *b* (*except* P^2) proposes et promis (P^3 les) loiers aus b. et peines aus m.

88 deserviz: *D* desevres.

89 ore: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; est ore jugiee: *B* ore est mise.

89-90 li mauvais . . . guerredonné: P^1C^2 *inverted* (li bon s. guer. et li m. s. puni).

89 soient: *BRb om.*

90 propre (*a*): *b om.*

91 ainçois: P^2 *om.*

92 de . . . avenir: *B om.*; seront (*a*P^2DF^2): *S* seroit $P^3A^1A^2M$ seroient.

94 les: P^1C^2 ses *the rest om.*; *s'ensuit* (*a except* C^1; *DS* -sieut): $C^1F^2P^2P^3A^1A^2M$ s'en e.; *descouvenue*: P^1 decogneue C^1 desconveignable *S* desconvenablete.

95 nule: P^1C^2 *om.*; plus felonnesse: *B om. M* p. felonne.

96 touz: *B om.*

97 valoir (*a*): *b* voloir.

100 espereroit: *M* esperoit.

101 des destinees: *D sing. B* distinctes.

toutez les chosez que on puet desirer *et puis que esperance et prierez ne valent riens?* Donques sera *ostee et* tolue celle seule aliance entre (39*ra*) les hommes et dieu, c'est a savoir de esperer et de prier. Mais nous, par le pris de droituriere *et de vraie* humilité, deservons le guerredon de la divine grace qui n'est mie prisablez et c'est la seule maniere, *ce est assavoir esperance et prierez,* par quoi il semble que li homme puissent parler avec dieu et, par raison de supplicacion, estre conjoint a celle clarté qui n'est pas aprochiee, et neis avant que il l'empetrent. Et se on croit que esperance ne prieres n'ont nulles forcez par la neccessité des chosez a avenir receue, quelle chose sera par quoy nous puissons estre conjoint et nous aherdre a celui souverain prince des chosez? Par quoy il couvendra par neccessité que li humains lignagez, si comme tu chantoiez un pou ci devant, soit departiz et desjoins *et estrangiéz* de sa fontaine et faudra de venir a son commencement, *c'est a dieu.*

[METRE III.]

Quelle cause descordable a *depecié et* desjoint les aliancez des chosez, *c'est les conjonctions de dieu et de homme?* Quiex diex a establi si grans bataillez entre ces deus chosez vraiez, *c'est entre la divine pourveance et franche volenté,* si que, se elles sont senglez, *dessevrees et* chascune par soy, elles ne veulent pas estre melleez ne eulz entresouffrir a estre ensemble? Ou s'il n'a nulle descorde entre ces chosez qui vraiement sont et s'entretiennent touz jours certaines ensemble? Mais la pensee *des hommes* confondue par les membres *du corps* qui l'avuglent *et l'occurcissent* ne puet pas, par la vigheur de son occurci regart, cognoistre les soutilz enlacemens de ces deus chosez, *c'est a dire comme elles s'entreseufrent et s'en-* (39*rb*) *tretiennent ensemble.* Mais pour quoy s'eschaufe elle par si grant desirier a trouver les couvertez notez de verité? Scet elle *que elle ait cogneu* ce que elle requiert angoisseusement a cognoistre? Mais qui est cil qui se travaille a savoir les chosez cogneuez? Ou se elle ne les scet, que quiert cele avugle? Car qui est cil qui desire ce dont il ne scet riens, ou qui est cil qui puisse suivre les chosez non seuez? *Et se il les quiert,* ou les trouvera il? Qui est cil qui puisse cognoistre la forme trouvee que il mescognoist? Ou se la pensee des hommes, quant elle regardoit la haute pensee *de dieu,* avoit elle cogneu ensemble la somme des chosez et chascune par soy? Ores quant elle est

---

102 desirer: P^1C^2 desirier $P^3A^1A^2M$ deviser; *et* (*prierez*): *B* ne.

103 *riens*: P^1C^2 *om.*; *ostee et* tolue (*a*): *b inverted.*

104 et (dieu): *BR* de; de (esperer): P^1 des.

105 droituriere (RP^2DS): $P^1C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ droiture *B* droitē C^1F^2 droite; *et de:* A^2 *om.* P^3A^1M et.

109 aprochiee (-chee): $P^1C^1C^2DS$ aprochie; l'empetrent: P^1BC^1M empetrent *R* empoitrent *D* empeechent; croit: *BRb* (*except DS*) ne c.

110 ont (*a except* C^1; P^2DSF^2): *the rest* aient.

111 quelle: P^3 que la; puissons: F^2 puissiens; aherdre (aerdre): *R* aherdoir P^1C^2 aherdoit.

112 celui: BP^2DS celi.

114 *estrangiéz* (BRP^2DF^2): $P^1C^1C^2S$ estrangez $P^3A^1A^2M$ estrange: de venir a: *B om.*

METRE III.

This meter is incomplete in A^3.

1 *depecié* (P^1BF^2): P^4b (*except* DSF^2) despecie C^2 despechie *R* depecies C^1 depeciet *D* depichiet *S* despiciet.

2 c'est (*editor's correction from Chaucer*): *a om.* b et A^3 et toutes; Quiex diex (quel dieu): *DS* qui P^2 quiex A^3 que dieu A^2 quel die.

3 *entre* (*la d.*): P^1C^2 *om.*

4 senglez: *b om.* C^1 seules; chascune: A^3P^4 de ch.

5 eulz entre: A^3P^4B *om.*; eulz: P^3D elles *S* elle.

5-7 Ou . . . ensemble: *B om.*

5-6 Ou s'il: A^3 aussi P^4 ainsi.

6 entretiennent: P^4 entraiment.

7 touz jours certaines: P^2 *om.* P^1C^2 t. j. certez.

8-9 la vigheur de (C^1): $P^1C^2BRP^4$ *om. the rest* la vertu de.

9 occurci: A^2 obscurcie *R* oscurte.

10 *comme* (P^1C^2): *the rest* comment.

11 pour quoy: *B* comment; trouver; P^4 couvrir; les: P^1B ses C^2 ces *D* le.

12 notez: P^1B noces; Scet: *R* se.

13 angoisseusement: P^1C^2 angoissement; se travaille: P^1C^2 ci (C^2 si) se travaillent.

14 que: P^1C^2 qui; cele: P^1C^2 cel $P^3A^1A^2M$ elle; avugle: *DS* avule.

15 suivre: *S* sieuir C^1 siurre *D* servir que.

16 *se il*: P^1 cil C^2 si.

17 mescognoist: *DS* ne cognoist.

19 chascune: *B* chascun.

19-20 est reposte: P^4 repost.

reposte en l'ocurté des membrez, n'a elle pas du tout oublié soy meismes et retient la somme des chosez et pert les singularitéz? Donques quiconques requiert verité, il ne est ne en l'un ne en l'autre habit, *ne sachans ne non sachans;* car il n'a pas cogneu toutez chosez ne ne les a pas du tout toutez oubliees, ainçois li remembre bien de la somme que il retient et demande conseil et retraite parfondement les chosez devant veuez, pour ce qu'il puisse ajuster les partiez oubliees aus parties retenuez."

[PROSE IV.]

Lors dist ele: "C'est", dist elle, "l'ancienne question de la pourveance de dieu; et Marchus Tullius, quant il devisa la divinacion, forment demena ceste question et tu meismes l'as moult quise du tout et longuement, mais encorez n'a elle pas esté jusques ci asséz diligemment ne fermement *determi-* (39*va*) *nee ne* despeciee de nul de vous. Et la cause de ceste occurté *et de ceste ignorance* est pour ce que li mouvement de la raison humaine ne se puet ajuster a la simplece de la divine prescience; mais se li homme la poissent penser en aucune maniere, *si que il pensassent les chosez si comme diex les voit,* nulle doubtance n'i demorroit lors. Et ce assaieré je a la parfin a demonstrer et a despecier, quant je auré premierement respondu aus raisons par quoy tu es esmeuz. Car je te demant pour quoy tu cuidez que celle raison de ceulz qui solent *le neu de* ceste question ne soit pas asséz fort *ne suffisant,* la quelle raison, pour ce que elle juge que la prescience n'est pas cause de neccessité aus chosez a avenir, toutevois ne cuide elle pas que franchise de volenté soit empechiee par la prescience. Car ne traiz tu pas d'ailleurs argument de la neccessité des chosez a avenir fors que de ce que les chosez qui sont avant seuez ne peuent en nulle maniere estre empechieez que elles n'aviengnent? Se la prescience donques n'ajuste nulle neccessité aus chosez a avenir, si comme tu neis le recognoissoiez un pou ci devant, quelle chose est par quoy les fins volenterines des chosez soient contraintez a certain avenement? Car par grace de posicion, pour ce que tu entendez miex ce qui s'en ensuit, posons que nulle prescience ne soit. De tant donques comme il apartient a ce, les chosez qui viennent de franche volenté seront elles donques (39*vb*) contraintez avenir par neccessité?" "Non".

"Or posons de rechief que prescience soit, mais que elle ne mete nulle neccessité es chosez; je croi que celle meismes franchise de volenté demourra enterine et desliee. Mais tu pourras dire que, ja soit ce que la prescience n'est pas cause de la neccessité des chosez

---

20 du tout oublié: P^2DSF^2 oub. du t. *BR* du tout.
21 quiconques: *R om.*
22 verité: P^1RA^2 veritez; ne en . . . habit (*editor's correction*): *all mss*: ne l'un (P^1 l'une) ne l'autre en habit.
22-3 *ne non sachans*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
23 ne ne . . . toutez: P^2 *om.*
23-4 du tout toutez oubliees: P^1 toutez oub. du t. P^4 du t. oub. toutes P^3D du t. oub. P^2 oubliees.
26 les partiez: P^4B *om.*; oubliees: A^2 omblices: aus . . . retenues: A^2 *inserts in the following Prose after* dist elle (*l.* 1); retenues: P^4 *om.*

PROSE IV.

1 ele: P^1 est.
2 devisa (aP^2F^2): *the rest* devina; demena: *B* devisa.
4 jusques: *R* justes *D* donquez; diligemment ne fermement: P^3 longuement ne dilig. *B* diligent *R* diligans.
4-48 ne fermement . . . en leurs naturez nulle: *BR om.*
5 despeciee (P^1): C^2P^2S -chiee C^1D despeechiee $P^3A^1A^2M$ despechee F^3 despeschee.
7 se (li): P^1 ce.
8 la: A^2 les li; poissent (P^1): C^1 peuissent A^2 pēssēt *the rest* peussent; *si que il*: *DS* et.
10 et a despecier: *b om.*; je auré: P^2 j'auroi *S* jaray; premierement: P^2 premerainement.
12 raison: P^1 *om.*
14 aus (P^1C^2): A^1F^2 es *the rest* en.
15 volenté: *DS* arbitre; ne traiz tu: *DS* tu ne t.
19 aus: $C^1P^2DSF^2$ es; neis: *b* meismes C^1 *om.*; pou: C^1 poi *S* pau *b* (*except S*) petit.
20 par (P^1C^2): *b* (*except* P^2) pour C^1P^2 *abbrev*; volenterines: P^1C^2 volenterins *DS* volentieuez.
21 posicion: P^1C^2 possion A^1 posicōn A^2 poicōn *M* poitōn: en *b om.*
23 a ce les (P^1DS): *the rest* a celles.
24 par: *DS* de; Non: P^3 non diz je.
25 posons: C^1 possons *b* metons.

a avenir (*ou que ja soit ce que neccessité d'avenir n'est pas par la prescience es chosez a avenir*), toutevoiz est elle signe que les chosez avendront par neccessité, *si que, se elle n'est cause de la neccessité, au mains est elle signe de la neccessité.* Par ceste maniere donques, neis se la prescience n'eust onques esté, toutevois seroit ce certaine chose *par ce signe* que li avenement des chosez a avenir seroient neccessaire. Car touz signes demonstre *et senefie* quelle la chose est, mais il ne fait pas la chose que il senefie. Par quoy il convient avant demonstrer que nulle chose n'avient qui n'aviegne par neccessité, a ce que il apere que la prescience soit signe de ceste neccessité; autrement, se ceste neccessité est nulle, certez celle prescience ne pourra pas estre signe de la chose qui n'est pas. Mais nous sommes ja certain que preuve, soustenue par ferme raison, doit estre amenee non mie de signes ne de argumens quis par dehors *si comme par tesmoings,* mes des causez couvenablez et necessairez. Mais, *tu diras se tu veulz,* comment peut il estre fait que les chosez n'aviengnent pas qui sont pourveuez a avenir? Aussi comme se nous cuidions que les chosez n'avendront pas que la pourveance de (40*ra*) dieu scet avant a avenir. Mais ce ne devons nous pas cuidier, ainçois devons miex *ce croire* et jugier que, ja soit ce que elles aviengnent, toutevois n'ont elles eu en leurs naturez nulle neccessité par quoy elles avenissent. Et ce pourras tu legierement apercevoir par ce *semblable* que je te dirai. Car nous veons pluseurs chosez quant elles sont faitez devant nos yeulz, si comme on voit les charretiers ouvrer en leurs charretez adrecier et flechir, et aussi *pues tu entendre des ouvriers de* touz autres *mestiers.* A il donques neccessité *en nostre regart* qui contraingne *ces chosez ou* aucune de celes ainsi estre faitez?" "Non. Car pour niant seroit li faiz *et l'euvre* de l'art, se toutez ces chosez estoient meues *et faitez* par la contraingnance *de nostre veue.*"

"Les chosez donques qui, quant on les fait, n'ont nulle neccessité que on les face, aussi celles meismes, avant que elles soient faitez, sont a faire sans neccessité. Par quoy aucunes chosez sont a avenir des quiex li avenemens *et la fin* sont *quitez et* delivrez de toute neccessité. Car certez je ne cuit pas que nulz homs ce deist que les chosez que on fait ores ne fussent *a faire et* a avenir, avant que on les feist, et que celles meismes, neis se elles fussent avant seues, ne eussent frans avenemens *nommie neccessairez.* Car, aussi comme la science des chosez presentez ne porte point de neccessité aus chosez que l'en fait, aussi la prescience des chosez a avenir ne porte nulle neccessité aus chosez qui avendront. Mais tu diras que de ce meismes (40*rb*) doubte l'en: savoir mon, se des chosez qui n'ont pas avenemens neccessairez, s'il en puet estre aucune prescience. Car il i semble avoir descort: si comme se elles sont pourveues, neccessité les ensuit; se

---

29-30 *ou . . . avenir:* C^1b *om.*
31 *se elle n'est:* M elle est.
32 donques (A^1C^1 dont): P^1C^2 *om.*
33 onques esté: P^1 *inverted.*
34 seroient: $P^1C^1C^2S$ seroit; touz signes ($C^1C^2P^2D$): P^1 touz signe *the rest* tout signe.
35 *senefie:* D ensaigne.
36 que nulle: P^1C^2 quelle; n'avient: P^1C^2 avient.
37 aviegne: P^1C^2 avient.
37-8 a ce . . . de ceste necc.: F^2 *om.*
38 *first* ceste: b la; *second* ceste: b (*except* DS) la DS li.
43 il: C^2b *om.*; pas: b *om.*; qui: b puis que eles.
44 pourveuez: MA^1 prouvees; cuidions: C^1P^2DS cuidons.
46 ce (ne): P^1 se; devons miex: P^1P^3 dev. nous m.
47 n'ont: P^1 vōt; eu: P^1C^2b (*except* P^2DS) *om.*
51 en . . . flech. et: D *om. but inserted further on* (*l.* 59) *between* sont *and* quitez; entendre: B *om.*
52 neccessité: R necc. ajouste.
54 seroit: D seront.
55 meues: P^1C^2 muees D *om.*
56 qui: $C^1RP^3A^1A^2M$ que DS *om.*
56-8 que on . . . neccessité: B *om.*
57 avant: D anschois S ainchois; sans: P^1 par.
59 *et* (*la*): P^1C^2 en; *quitez:* S quitte D toute; cuit: $P^3A^1A^2M$ croy.
60 ce (*a*): b *om.*
61 a: $P^1C^2BP^2$ *om.*; neis: P^1 ne BC^1 *om.*
62 fussent: b (*except* A^2DS) ne f.
65 de: P^1 *om.*
67 prescience: D pour science A^1 p'science; i: $P^1C^2A^2DS$ *om.* BRP^2 li.
68 si (*a*): b *om.*; pourveues: P^1C^2 prouvees.

neccessité leur fault, elles ne peuent estre seues avant, car riens ne puet estre compris par science fors certain. Et se les chosez qui n'ont pas certain avenement sont pourveues aussi comme certainez, ce sera occurté de oppinion, nommie verité de science. Car cuidier de une chose autrement que elle n'est, tu croiz bien que c'est divers *et hors* de l'enterineté de science. Et la cause de ceste erreur est de ce que toutez les chosez que chascuns a cogneuez, il cuide que eles soient conneues tant seulement par la force et par la nature des chosez *qui sont cogneuez ou* qui sont seues. Et touz li contrairez en avient; car tout quanque est cogneu, il est miex compris *et cogneu* nommie selonc sa force ne sa nature, mais selonc le pooir *et la nature* des chosez cognoissans. Car pour ce que ce soit apert par brief example: une meismes rondece d'un corps, autrement la cognoist il regars de l'ueil et autrement li atoichemens. Li regars, par ses rais la gitéz, voit de loing *sens soy mouvoir* tout le corps ensemble; mais li atoichemens qui se ahert et se conjoint au corps reont et se muet entour lui comprent par partiez l'avironnement de la rondece. Neis homme meismes autrement le regarde sens, autrement ymaginacion, autrement raison, autrement intelligence. Car li sens comprent la figure du corps de l'omme establie en la matere sommise, mais l'ymaginacion comprent (40*va*) la seule figure sens la matere. Raison seurmonte ymaginacion et comprent, par un commun regart, l'espece commune qui est es singulierez piecez. Mais l'euil de l'intelligence est plus haus; car elle seurmonte l'avironnement de la communité et regarde avec ce, par pure soutillité de pensee, celle meismes forme simple de l'omme *qui est pardurablement en la pensee divine.* Et en ces quatre chosez doit on moult ce regarder que la plus haute force de comprendre les chosez embrace *et contient* la plus basse, mais la plus basse ne se lieve pas en nulle maniere jusques a la plus haute. Car sens ne puet nulle chose comprendre hors de matere, ne l'imaginacion ne regarde pas les especez universelez, ne raison ne comprent pas la simple forme, *si comme intelligence la prent,* mais intelligence qui regarde aussi comme par dessus, quant elle a la forme comprise, elle *cognoist* neis *et* devise toutez les chosez qui sont souz celle forme, mais *elle les cognoist* en celle maniere en la quelle elle comprent celle meismes simple forme qui ne pourra jamés estre cogneue a nulle des autres *trois forces de l'ame dessus dites.* Car elle

---

69 seues: P^1 seue; riens: *B* nulz.
71 certainez ce: *B* certainete.
72-3 Car . . . science: *R om.*
73 divers: *b* diverse chose; (*hors*) de: P^1 *om.*
75 cuide (P^2DSF^2): *the rest* cuident; il cuide . . . conneues: P^1C^2 *om.*
75-6 la force et par (*a*): *b om.*; *cogneuez* (*a*): *b* avenues.
77 compris (*BR*): *the rest* apris.
78 selonc sa force ne (P^1C^2R; *the rest* et): P^3 de force et selon.
79 cognoissans: $P^1C^2P^2$ *om.*; apert (P^1C^2R): C^1 voirs apert *B* apert et *b* aperte chose.
80-1 autrement . . . atoichemens: *b* li regars de l'ueil la cognoist autrement et li atouchemens autrement.
81 gitéz: *B* guete.
83 se (conjoint): *b om.*; reont (roont): P^1 iront A^2 roent.
84 la: P^1C^2 *om. DS* le (*R for* de la rondece: de la reon (*506e*) du (*506f*) compas).
84-5 autrement . . . intelligence; F^2P^2 le regarde aut. sens . . et intelligence A^1A^2M regarde sens aultrement, ym. ault., rais. ault. et intell. P^3 sens reg. aut., im. aut., rais. aut. et int. *B* sanz aut. ymag. et aut. rayson.
85-7 aut. intell. . . . sommise: *B om.*
86 li: P^1 la li; sens: C^2 soul; establie: P^1P^3 estable *D* establi.
87 sommise: P^3 subiecte.
88 Raison: P^1C^2 mais r.
89 espece commune: *B* espoisse comme ce; piecez: *D* pites: l'euil: P^2DS li ieux.
90 l'intell. (aF^2): *the rest omit* l'; haus: P^1C^2 *om.*; car elle seurm.: *B om.*; l'aviron.: *B* de l'avir.
92-3 Et en ces (*a*): *b* (*except* A^2D) en ces A^2D et ces.
93 moult ce: P^2S *inverted* P^1 moult; force: *B* fortune.
94 la plus basse: *B pl.*
95 maniere: *B om.*
96 matere: *b* (*except* P^2): la m.; l': $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; reg. pas: P^1 r. pas si.
97 les especez univ.: *B* unite; comprent ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* prent; forme: *B* fortune.
99-100 comprise . . . forme: *B om.*
100 celle: *BDS* tele.
101 elle comprent: *B* e. meismes sousprent.
102 *trois* ($P^3A^1A^2M$): P^2 *om. the rest* III.; *forces* (*a*): *b* formes; *de l'ame*: *B* des ames.

cognoist et l'université de raison et la figure de l'imaginacion et le sensible material *conceu par sens;* ne elle ne use pas ne de raison ne de ymaginacion ne de sens, ainçois regarde toutez chosez ensemble par un seul coup de pensee formablement *et par essancialité,* pour ce que je ne le sai autrement dire. Certez raison, quant elle regarde aucune chose universele, elle ne use pas (40*vb*) ne de ymaginacion ne de sens et, toutevoiz, comprent elle les chosez imaginablez et sensiblez. Car c'est celle qui deffenist ainsi l'universel de sa concepcion: homme est beste a deus piez raisonnable. Et comme ceste cognoissance soit universele, toutevoiz n'est il nulz qui bien ne sache que homs est chose ymaginable et sensible; et ce meismes regarde bien raison, mais ce n'est mie par ymaginacion ne par sens, ainçois le regarde par raisonnable concepcion. Aussi ymaginacion, ja soit ce que elle prengne des sens le commencement de veoir et de former les figurez, toutevois, neis se sens ne li estoit pas presens, avironne elle *et comprent* toutez chosez sensiblez nommie par raison sensible de jugier, mais par raison ymaginative. Vois tu donques que, en cognoissant, toutez les chosez *cognoissans* usent plus de leur pooir que du pooir des chosez qui sont cogneuez? Ne ce n'est mie tors; car comme touz jugemens soit li fait du jugeur, il couvient que chascuns parfaice son euvre *et s'entencion* nommie du pooir estrange, mais du sien propre.

[METRE IV.]

Li Porchez, *c'est une porte de Athenes ou li philosophe se assembloient pour desputer de toutez chosez, cil porchez* aporta jadis veillars trops occurs en leurs sentencez qui creoient que li sens et les ymagez *par quoy on comprent les chosez* venissent des corps dehors es ames *comprenans* et fussent enpraint es pensees *par les corps dehors,* si comme nous soulons aucune foiz par un isnel greffe fichier letres empraintez (41*ra*) en la planice de la page *de cire ou de parchemin* qui n'a *nulles figurez ne* nulles notes en soy. Mais se la pensee vigueureuse ne fait riens par ses propres mouvemens, ainçois seuffre tant seulement et se gist sommise aus notez *et aus figurez* des corps *et des chosez de hors* et rent les ymages des chosez cassez *et vaines* a la maniere du miroer, dont nous vient donques ceste cognoissance qui toutez chosez regarde, tant en nostre courage vaillans? Et dont est celle force qui regarde les chosez singulierez ou celle qui devise les chosez cogneuez ou celle qui conquieut les chosez devisees et qui entrechange sa

---

103 et (l'un.): P^1C^2 *om.*; la (figure): P^1C^2 a la: l'imag.: C^1Rb *om.* l'.
104 sensible: *R* sencible A^2 sēblabe.
104 *conceu*: P^1 cogneu; *par sens*: P^1 p. ceulz; ne use: *R* mist.
106-7 le sai: C^2 les sai P^1 laissai *S* say.
107 Certez: *S* ceste.
107-8 aucune ch. univ.: *B* une ch.
108 ne (use): *B om.*; de (sens): P^1C^2 *om.*
110 sa: P^1C^2 la.
110-4 homme . . . concepcion: *B om.*
114 Aussi: P^2DS ainsi.
115 ja: P^1C^2 et ja; prengne (*a*): *b* compraigne; le commencement (*a*): *b pl.*
116 avironne elle: *B* environne en le.
118 en cognoissant: C^1 en angoussant.
118-9 toutez . . . *cognoissans* (*a except R*): *R* t. ch. cognoissēs *b* t. ch. les cog.
119 usent: *B* eussent.
119-20 plus de . . . cogneuez: P^3 plus de voulente de leur pouoir que des choses cogneues.
120 tors: P^1 touz jours.

1 Porchez: C^1 porces *D* proches ($BP^3A^1A^2M$ le porche); *c'est*: C^1b (*except M*) est; *assembloient*: C^1 assamblent.
3 creoient (*D* crioient): $P^1C^2A^2$ croient; sens: P^4 san A^3 sain; ymagez: *B* imaginacions.
4 des: P^1 de; dehors (*a except* P^1; $A^1A^3P^4$): P^1 hors *the rest* de dehors; es: *BR* et.
5 enpraint (em-): P^4 compraint A^3 comprins; *dehors*: *R om.* *b* de dehors; soulons: *M* solions P^2 fesons.
6 un isnel: *R* un seul i. *DS* isniel; en: A^3P^4B a P^3 et; planice: A^1 -nise A^3C^1D -nite F^2 -nece P^4 -nette *BS* plainete.
8 fait: *B om*
10 cassez: C^1R quasses *D* quasses *S* quises F^2 *om.*
12 chosez: A^3P^4 *om.*; tant: $P^3A^1A^2M$ dont tant; en (*DS*): *the rest* est.
14 ou ($P^1C^2A^3$): *the rest* et; conquieut (C^1RP^2): $P^1C^2F^2$ conquiert P^3 conqueult *M* concueult *S* concoelle *D* conquelle A^1 conquieust A^2 conqueeust P^4 congnoit A^3B cognoist.

voie? Elle lieve aucune fois sa teste aus tres hautez chosez et chiet aucune fois es tres bassez et, quant elle se retourne en soy meismes, elle reprent *et destruit* les faussez chosez par les vraiez. Ceste force certez est la cause plus faisans et moult plus puissans *a veoir et a cognoistre les chosez* que celle cause qui seuffre *et reçoit* les notez *et les figurez* emprainte en maniere de matere. Toutevois la passion, *c'est la souffrance ou li sens,* qui est en corps vif, vet avant esveillans et esmouvans les forcez de la pensee. Si comme quant clarté fiert les yeulz *et les esmuet a veoir,* ou si comme vois *ou sons* heurte aus oreillez *et les esmuet a oir,* lors est esveilliee la vigueur de la pensee et *trait hors et* apele as samblablez mouvemens les formez que elle tient dedens soy et les ajuste aus notez *et aus chosez* de hors et melle les ymages *des chosez de hors* aus formes dedens soy repostez. (41*rb*)

[PROSE V.]

Mais se es corps a sentir, *c'est a dire, se a ce que li corps saient sentu et cogneu,* ja soit ce que les qualitéz des corps qui nous sont contremisez *et offertez* par dehors esmeuvent *et entalentent* les instrumens des sens, et ja soit ce que la passion du corps, *c'est li sens du corps,* aille devant la vigueur du courage ouvrant *et cognoissant,* la quelle passion *ou li quiex sens* apiaut le fait de la pensee en soy et esmeuve les formes qui se reposent endementiers dedens la pensee—se es corps a sentir, si comme je ai dit, nostre courage n'est pas *ennoblis ne* enseignéz par la passion *ne par le sens du corps a cognoistre les chosez,* mais les cognoist de sa propre force, de combien plus donques les chosez qui sont *franchez et* delivrez de touz entalentemens de corps, *comme dieu et li angelz, de combien plus se gardent il d'ensuivre, mais* n'ensuivent pas les chosez contremisez par dehors, ainçois despechent le fait de leur pensee *sens les chosez et sens les corporiex sens.* Par ceste raison donques diverses cognoissances avindrent a diverses substances. Car li sens du corps, li quiex seus est desnuéz *et desgarniz* de toutez autres cognoissancez, vint aus bestez non mouvablez (*qui mouvoir ne se peuent*), si comme sont *les oestrez,* les hanons et les autres conchez de la mer qui se aherdent et sont norriez es roichez; mais l'ymaginacion vint aus bestez mouvablez qui semblent avoir aucun entalentement de fuir ou de desirer aucune chose. Mais raison est tant seulement de l'umain

---

15 sa: A^3P^4B la; aus (aux, as): P^1 au C^1 en $P^3A^1A^2M$ es.
16 et: *b om.*; elle (reprent): P^4 et le.
17 par les vraiez: P^2 *om.*
18 plus (faisans): *M* la plus; *veoir*: A^3P^4 nier *BR* noier.
19 notes: A^3 nettes P^4 nestes; en maniere ($P^1BRA^3P^4$): C^1C^2 a m. *b* a la m.
20 matere (*a*): *b* la m. A^3 *om.*; *li sens*: P^4 lissue.
21 en corps: C^1b (*except* F^2) ou c. *R* ou cors BF^2 encore C^2 oncores A^3P^4 en tour; vet (P^1R): C^1C^2 vait *Bb* va; vif vet: A^3P^4 viflut; esveillans: P^4 queillans.
22 quant . . . comme: *B om.*
23 la vigueur: A^3 laígreur.
24 as samblablez (*a*A^3): F^2 en sem. *b* ensemble; mouvemens (*a except* C^1; A^3F^2): P^2DS esmouvemens $P^3A^1A^2M$ aux esmouvemens C^1 mouvans.
25 les: A^3P^4 se.
26 repostez: A^3P^4B encloses C^1 repuses.

PROSE V.

1 se . . . sentir: *B* les estors a sentu; *se* (*a ce*): *B* que.
3 *offertez*: *D* esforces: des sens et ($P^1C^1C^2F^2$): BRP^2DS de s. et $P^3A^1A^2M$ dedens.
4 *c'est . . . corps*: *b om.* C^1 c'est li s.
5 apiaut (*editor's correction*): P^1 aprant C^2 aprent C^1 ap'nt *B* apaínt *R* apeaut *b* apele.
6 esmeuve: *BR* esmuevent P^3A^1 esmeut *DS* esmoet *M* esmeuet A^2 eusmēt.
7 es corps a sentir: *B* estors a sentu; si: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
8 *ennoblis*: $P^1P^3A^1A^2M$ en oubli C^2 en oubliz.
10-1 de touz entalentemens: *b om.*
11 *dieu et*: *b om.*; *angelz* (P^1BA^2M): C^1P^2DS angle C^2P^3 anges *R* ange F^2 angele A^1 angres.
12 *d'ensuivre*: *B* de usure; *mais*: *b* mais il (ilz): n'ensuivent: *B* n'ensuit il *R* n'ensuit.
13 despechent: *B* despiecent.
14-5 Par . . . substances: P^1 *om.*
14 avindrent: *B* en viennent.
15 li sens . . . est: *DS* sens tous seus (*S* seuls); li quiex seus est: *b* (*except DS*) qui est seus (seul) sans estre (*in* F^2 estre *om.*) P^1BR li q. sens est C^1C^2 li quel est.
17 *oestrez*: C^1 hoistes *B* distres; les han.: P^1C^2 et les h.; conchez: *B* chouthes $RP^3A^1A^2M$ choses.
18 es: *B* en; roichez (P^1C^2): *the rest* roches.
20 desirer: $P^1C^2BA^2$ desirier; est tant: A^2 ētent.

lignage, si comme seule intelligence est de divine nature. Dont il s'ensuit que ceste cognoissance vault miex que toutez les autres qui cognoist par sa propre nature (41*va*) nommie seulement ce qui li apartient propre a sa cognoissance, mais elle cognoist neis les sugiéz de toutez autres cognoissancez. Que sera donques, se sens et ymaginacion contredient a raison et dient de celle chose universele que raison cuide veoir que ce est niant? Car ce qui est sensible ou ymaginable, ce ne puet estre universel; donques ou li jugemens de raison est vrais, mais nulle chose sensible ne est, ou comme raison sache bien que pluseurs chosez sont sommisez a sens et a ymaginacion, donques est vaine *et fausse* la concepcion de raison qui regarde *et comprent* ce qui est sensible et singulier aussi comme un universel. Se raison voloit a ces chosez encontre respondre et deist que vraiement regarde elle *et comprent* par raison de universalité et ce qui est sensible et ce qui est ymaginable, mais que ces deus, *c'est assavoir sens et ymaginacion*, ne se peuent pas eslever *ne ataindre* a cognoissance de universalité pour ce que leur cognoissance ne pourroit pas seurmonter les corporiex figurez, et que, certez, de la cognoissance des chosez on devroit miex croire au plus parfait et au plus ferme jugement—en ceste tençon donques nous qui avons force et de raisonner et de ymaginer et de sentir, *c'est a dire de comprendre par raison, par ymaginacion et par sens*, ne loerions nous pas miex la cause de raison? Semblable chose est *a ce que nous voulons ici dire, c'est assavoir* que raison humaine ne cuide pas que (41*vb*) la divine intelligence regart *ou cognoisse* les chosez a avenir, fors que si comme raison meismes humaine les cognoist. Car tu peus ainsi dire: s'il est avis aus hommes que aucunes chosez n'aient avenemens certains et neccessairez, certainement elles ne peuent estre seuez avant a avenir. Donques ne est nulle la prescience de ces chosez et, se nous croions que prescience soit certaine en ces choses, donques ne sera nulle chose qui n'aviengne par neccessité. Se nous donques peussons avoir le jugement de la divine pensee, si comme nous sommes parçonnier de raison, si comme nous avons jugié que il couvient que ymaginacion et sens soient au dessouz de raison, aussi jugerions nous que tres droituriere chose seroit que raison humaine se sousmeist a la divine pensee. Par quoy, se nous poons, eslevons nous en la hautece de celle souveraine divine intelligence, car illec verra raison ce que elle ne puet regarder en soy meismes. Certez ce est comment la prescience de dieu voit toutevois certaines et determinees les

---

21 si: P^1C^2 et si; intelligence: R negligence; de: P^1 *om.*; divine: C^2 vraie.
23 qui: P^1R qu'il A^1A^2SM que; (*B for* ce qui li: aussi comme il y).
24 sugiéz: C^2P^2 sougiez BA^2SF^2 subgiez R souges C^1A^1 subges M subgetz P^3 subjietz D sages; autres: *b om.*
25 sera: *DS* sera ce.
26 dient: *b* dient que.
27 ce (qui): P^1C^2 *om.*; ce (ne): *b om.*
28 jugemens (*from* P^2DF^2): P^1 -ment; de: *B* don.
29 sache: *B* sal'ba.
30 a; *from B; the rest om.*
31 un ($P^1C^2P^2SF^2$): *the rest om.*
32 encontre resp.: *b* (*except DS*) *inverted DS* respondre; deist: *DS* d. encontre.
33 elle: *BR* celle.
34 que: P^1 *om.*; deus: *B* dous; *assavoir*: *B* a dire.
34-5 de univ. . . . cognoissance: *B om.*
37 et que: *editor's addition.*
38 parfait . . . ferme (P^1C^2): *the rest inverted*; ceste tençon: *BR* c. raison *M* c. entention A^2 ce entencōn.
39 et (de rais.): *b om.*; raisonner: P^1 res.
39-40 de sentir . . . et: *D om.*
40 *de comprendre*: *B om.*
41 loerions (C^2F^2; P^2DS loeriens): P^1 lorions *BR* lairion *the rest* loerons (lou-).
42 *voulons*: P^1C^2 *om.*; *ici*: *B om.*
44 meismes: *Bb om.*; les: $P^1C^2P^2$ le.
45 n'(aient): P^1C^2 *om.*
46 avant: *b om.*
47 ne: *b om.*; de ces: P^3 des.
48 prescience . . . choses (F^2): *the rest* elles sont certaines.
49 n'(aviengne): P^1 *om.*; par: P^1C^2 de; peussons (*RS*): P^2 -iens $P^3A^1A^2M$ -ions C^1 peuissons *D* peuissiens P^1C^2 pensons F^2 pensiēs.
52-3 aussi . . . raison: *B om.*
53 Par (P^1BRP^2): C^1C^2 *abbrev. the rest* pour.
54 eslevons nous: *DS* elle nous drechast; en: *B* a; souveraine: *a* (*except B*) *om.*; divine intell.: A^2M *inverted* P^3 pensee d. A^1 divine.
56 comment: P^1C^2 comme; toutevois: *D* toutes.

chosez neis qui n'ont pas certains avenemens; ne ce n'est pas opinion, *si comme tu as dit,* ainçois est mieux la simplece de la souverainne science qui n'est enclose par nulz termes.

[METRE V.]

Par maintes diversez figurez trespassent les bestes par les terrez, car les unes ont les corps estanduz et rampent es poudres et s'esmeuvent a aler par la force de leur piz et traient aprés eus une raie continuee *si comme serpens.* (42*ra*) Les autres bestes ont legieres eles dont ilz batent les vens et trespassent les espassez de l'air lonc par vol apert aussi comme en noant. Les autres s'esjoissent en faire leurs tracez *et leurs chemins* en terre par leurs piéz et en marchier ou par les champs ou par les bois vers. Et ja soit ce que tu les voies toutez descorder en diversez formez, toutevois leur encline face puet aggrever leurs reboichez sens *si que il ne se peuent pas eslever aus chosez souverainnes.*

La seule ligniee des hommes lieve plus haut sa haute teste et se drece legierement en estant o son corps droit et regarde les terrez dessouz soy. Ceste figure, se tu ne es hors du sens, tu qui requiers le ciel par droit visage et lievez ton front en haut, t'amonneste que tu portez aussi ton courage en haut, si que ta pensee ne soit pas grevee des terriennes chosez ne ne descende pas plus basse souz eulz, puis que tes corps est levéz plus haut.

[PROSE VI.]

Pour ce donques, si comme nous avons monstré un pou ci devant, que toute chose qui est seue n'est pas cogneue par sa propre nature, mais par la nature des chosez cognoissans, or regardons donques, tant comme il nous loist *et tant comme nous poons,* quiex est li estaz de la divine substance, pour ce neis que nous puissons cognoistre quiex est la science de li. Li communs jugemens donques de toutez creaturez raisonnablez est que diex est pardurablez, *c'est a dire sens fin et sens commencement.* Or regardons donques quelle chose est pardurableté, car ceste nous demonstrera ensemble (42*rb*) et la divine nature et la divine science.

Pardurableté donques est parfaite possession et toute ensemble de vie nommie terminable et ce nous apert plus clerement par la comparoison des chosez temporiex. Car toute chose qui vit en temps, c'est present qui s'en

---

METRE V.

1 Par maintes: A^3 p. quoy m.; par (les): A^3P^4 et; terrez: A^3P^4B termes.

2 les corps estanduz: *b sing.*; rampent: A^3B rompent *b* repost; et (s'esm.): *b* si; s'esmeuvent: A^3 s'esforcent.

3 la: $P^1C^2A^2$ *om.*; aprés: P^3A^1DS empres; continuee: P^3A^2M continue.

4 legieres: P^1 legieces; eles: P^1C^2 *om.* $C^1A^2DP^4$ elles A^3 helles *M* aelles P^3 esles.

5 de l'air: *B* de leur A^3P^4 d'aler P^1 le l'air; en noant: *M* est n. A^2 est en n. P^3 est neant A^1 est vent A^3 en nouant.

6 s'esjoissent: F^2 s'enforcent; en (faire): A^3P^3MDS a.

7 leurs (piéz): A^3P^4B les; et en . . . vers: A^3 *om.*; en: *b* (*except* F^2) au.

8-9 leur encline face: A^3P^4 les enclines faces *B* les enclinēt leurs faces.

9 puet: *B* pour; reboichez (P^1C^2R): $P^3A^1A^2M$ rebouche P^2 -chie *D* -chiet F^2 -sche P^4B -ches *S* reblonchiet C^1 rebochies A^3 rebources; sens: *B* sanz A^3 sain; *que il:* P^4 qui; se: *b* (*except* A^2) le C^1A^2 les.

10 aus: *b* jusques aus.

11 ligniee (P^1BM): $A^3P^4F^2$ lignee *the rest* lignie; se: $P^1C^1C^2A^2$ *om.*

12 estant: P^3A^2M estat; terrez: A^3P^4B choses; *followed by* droites (*R*), droit (*B*); soy (*a*): *b* lui (P^2 li).

13 ne es: A^3 mes P^4 metz; du (aA^3): *b* de ton; requiers: C^1P^4 quiers; visage: A^3P^4D usage.

14 et lievez ($P^1C^1C^2P^2$): A^3P^4BR eslieve P^3M lieve A^2 leve A^1SF^2 lieves.

14-5 t'amon. . . . haut: C^1 *om.*

16 souz: A^3 sans P^4B sanz; eulz (*a*): *b* elles; tes (C^1P^2S): P^1C^2 ces A^3P^4 des *the rest* ton; levéz: *DS* veus; plus: $P^1C^1C^2$ en.

PROSE VI.

1 si comme: *B* puis que.

2 nature: $P^1C^1C^2B$ force *R om.*

4 loist: $P^1C^2P^2A^1M$ laist *R* lest A^2 plaist; quiex (P^1): *the rest* quelle.

5 de li ($P^1P^2DSF^2$): C^2 de dieu *the rest* de lui.

7 regardons: *B* regarde.

10 Pardurableté: BC^1 pardurable; donques est: P^1 *inverted.*

12 en (temps): *b* ou (A^2 au); c'est: *b om.*

vet des preteriz es futurs, *c'est a dire des temps passéz es temps a venir;* ne nulle chose n'est establie en temps qui puisse embracier ensemble toute l'espace de sa vie. Car certez elle ne tient pas encores le temps de lendemain et a ja perdu celui de hier; et certez en la vie de huy ne vivéz vous pas plus que en cest mouvable et trespassable moment. La chose donques qui seuffre temporelle condicion, ja soit ce, si comme dit Aristotes du monde, que celle chose n'ait onques eu commencement ne ne defaille jamais et que sa vie soit estendue avec l'infinté de temps, toutevois n'est ce pas chose telle que on croie par droit que elle soit pardurable. Car ja soit ce que elle compraingne et embrace l'espasce de vie sans fin, toutevois ne l'embrace elle pas tout ensemble, car les futurs, *ce sont les temps a venir,* encores ne les a elle pas; les préteriz, *ce sont les temps trespasséz,* elle ne les a mais. La chose donques qui comprent et tient ensemble toute la planté de vie nommie terminable, a qui du temps a venir riens ne li deffaut ne du temps passé riens ne li eschapa onques, ce est apelé *et demonstré* a estre pardurable par droit; et couvient que ceste chose soit touz jours presente a soy meismes et soit ordenerresse et puissant de touz ses desiriers et que elle ait toute presente (42*va*) l'infinité du mouvable temps. Dont aucuns cuident, mais non pas a droit, que quant il ont oy qu'il fu avis a Platon que li mondez n'avoit onques eu commencement de temps ne jamais n'aura fin, il cuident que en ceste maniere soit li mondez faiz ensemble pardurable avec son feseur. Mais autre chose est estre mené par vie nommie terminable —et ce donna Platon au monde—et autre chose est embracier ensemble toute la presence de vie nommie terminable, et clere chose est que ce est propre a la divine pensee. Car il ne nous doit pas estre avis que diex soit plus anciens des chosez faites par quantité *ou par qualité* de temps, mais miex par la proprieté de sa simple nature. Car icestui presentaire estat de vie non mouvable, cil non feniz mouvemens des chosez temporiex l'ensuit *et le resemble tant comme il puet* et, comme il ne le puisse ne contrefaire ne ensuivre, de la non muableté *qui est en la pardurableté de dieu* il deffaut *et chiet* en mouvement, et de la simplece de la presence *de dieu* il descraist *et defaut* en la non fenie quantité du futur temps et du preterit; et comme il ne puisse avoir ensemble toute la planté de sa vie, toutevois, pour ce que il ne delaisse jamais a estre en aucune maniere, il nous est avis qu'il ensuit *et resemble* en aucune maniere ce que il ne puet aconsuivre *ne faire* ne acomplir, et se lie *et conjoint* a aucune presence telle comme il la puet avoir,

---

13 vet: C^2R vait *the rest* va; *es (temps)*: *S* en *B* et; *venir*: P^1 avenir.

14 ne: P^1C^2 *om.*

16 la: *b* (*except* P^2F^2) ceste P^2F^2 sa.

16-7 vivéz vous: A^2 vivons nous.

17 moment: P^3A^1M mouvement moment.

18 Aristotes: $P^3A^1A^2M$ -te *S* Aristotiles.

19 du monde: P^3 *om.*; eu. P^1A^2 en.

20 l'infinité: C^1 l'infinitif; de: C^1 *om.* *b* du.

21 Car: *b* (*except* P^2) *om.*

22 compraingne: *DS* prenge; embrace: P^1 embrance.

23 l'embrace: *B* l'embraca P^1 embrance C^2 embrace; les futurs *ce sont*: P^3 *om.*; *venir*: C^1RA^2M avenir.

24 les preteriz *ce sont*: P^3 *om.*

25 planté ($P^1C^2RA^1M$): P^3 plenitude *the rest* plente.

26 du . . . deffaut (*a*): *b* (*except* P^2) ne deffault (A^2 deffent) riens du t. a venir P^2 riens ne li d. du t. a v.

27 li: *R* len; eschapa: C^1D escape A^1 achappe.

28 ceste (P^1C^2): *the rest* cele.

28-9 a soy (*a*): *b* en s.

29 desiriers: P^3MF^2 desirs.

30 aucuns: *SD* aultre.

31 mais: BP^3DS et C^1R *om.*

32 onques: P^1C^2 *om.*

33 ensemble: P^3 en soi.

34 mené (C^1BF^2): P^1C^2R meue *b* (*except* F^2) meu; terminable: P^1C^2 pardurable term.

35 et (ce): *b* *om.*

36 presence: P^2 pensee A^2S pñce; clere: *BR* chiere.

39 par: P^1C^2 de *R* *om.*; proprieté: *R* properite *B* psperite; simple nature: *B* simplesce naturele; presentaire (P^1C^2): *R* presentoire C^1 presentastre *Bb* present.

40 l'ensuit: *B* le fuit.

41 *le* (*res.*): *B* li *S* lez F^2 ls; ne le: C^1 *om.* P^1BDS ne; ne (contref.): *b* *om.*

42 ensuivre (*a*): *b* aconsuivre.

43 la non . . . *dieu*: *D* la mouvablete de dieu.

44 la non fenie: P^3 l'infenie.

45 planté (plenté): P^3 plentitude.

46-7 il nous . . . maniere: *B* *om.*

48 a: P^1C^2 en.

c'est assavoir de ce petit et isnel moment, et pour ce que ceste *momentaine petite et isnele presence* porte (42*vb*) une ymage *et une semblance* de celle permanant presence *de dieu*, a quiconques chosez que celle *momentaine presence* vient, elle leur donne ce que il leur est avis *que ces chosez ont estre et* que elles sont. Et pour ce que ceste presence ne pot remaindre *ne parfaitement remanoit*, pour ce ravi elle *et prist le airre* et le non feni chemin du temps *si que elle se muet sans fin par temps*, et par ceste maniere est il fait, pour ce que elle continuast sa vie en alant dont elle ne pot pas embracier la planté en permanant. Si que, se nous voulons aus chosez mettre dignes nons et Platon ensuivre, disons que certainement diex est pardurablez et li mondes est perpetuelz. Pour ce donques que touz jugemens *cognoist et* comprent selonc sa propre nature les chosez qui sont sommisez a lui et touz jours est a dieu pardurablez et presentairez estaz, la science aussi de lui qui seurmonte tout mouvement de temps maint en la simplece de sa presence et embrace les non feniz espassez du temps preterit et futur, *c'est a dire du temps passé et du temps a venir*, et regarde en sa simple cognoissance toutez chosez aussi comme se on les faisoit maintenant *presentement*. Se tu veulz donques penser *et contrepenser* la prescience par quoy il cognoist toutez chosez, tu ne la jugeras pas ainsi comme prescience de chose a venir, ainçois jugeras plus droitement que c'est science de presence qui onques ne deffaut; dont elle n'est pas apelee pr- (43*ra*) evidence, ainçois est plus droitement apelee pourveance qui est establie loing des chosez tres bassez et regarde de loing toutez chosez aussi comme du sommet d'une haute montaigne eslevee seur les chosez. Pour quoy deputez tu donques *et alleguez* que les chosez que diex voit *ou scet* soient faitez par neccessité, comme li homme meismes ne facent pas neccessairez les chosez que il voient faire *presentement devant leurs yeulz*? Car aus chosez que tu regardez presentez, li tiens regars ajuste il seur eulz nulle neccessité?" "Certez non."

"Et certez, se on puet faire digne comparoison du present divin et du present humain, aussi comme vous veéz aucunes chosez en ycestui vostre temporel present, aussi voit diex toutez chosez en son eternel *et pardurable* present. Par quoy ceste divine prescience ne mue pas la nature ne la

---

49 *c'est ass.*: *B om.*; isnel: P^3 legier; moment: C^2BS mouvement P^1 mouvemens; *momentaine* (mom'taine): P^1 montaine C^2B montaigne P^3 momentanee.
50 *isnele*: P^3 legiere; porte: *B* pour ce; une (ym.): P^1F^2 un.
51 quiconques (P^1C^2): P^2 quiex *D* quels *S* ql *the rest* quelconques (quelz-, ques-, queles-); *momentaine*: *B* montaigne P^1 mointaine P^2A^1M momēte *D* momenete A^2 momente.
52 ce que il: $P^1C^1C^2$ ce qui; leur est avis: C^1R nous est a. *b* nous semble; *ces chosez*: C^1 celles.
53 *estre*: $BC^1P^3A^1A^2M$ este; sont: *followed in B by* de vie non pas mouvable; remaindre (P^1B): *M* moindre *the rest* maindre.
54 *remanoit* (P^1C^2): A^1 remaner A^2 remonir F^2 demourer *the rest* remanoir; *le airre* (P^1C^1): *BR* lerre C^2 l'autre *b* la voie.
55 *muet* (meut): *a* (*except B*) meust.
56 pour ce: P^3 afin; pot: *BDS* peut (poet).
57 planté: *b* (*except* P^2): p. de vie.
57-8 nous . . . nons (*a*): *b* (*except* P^3A^2) nous v. mettre d. nons aus ch. P^3A^2 nous nous v. mettre d. aus ch.
58 Platon ens.: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted*.
59 est: $BP^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; perpetuelz (P^1RS): C^1 -tueus P^2 -tues *the rest* -tuel.
61 est: P^2DS *om.*; a (dieu): *b* en; estaz: *followed by* et *in all mss.*
62 maint: *B* ment.
63 non: $P^1C^2A^1A^2$ nons; feniz: C^1F^2 fenies.
64 simple: P^3 simplesse.
66 *presentement*: P^2DS *om.* P^3 et pr. (C^1: les maint. faisoit pres.); *contrepenser*: $P^3A^1A^2MDS$ c. a; prescience: *BR* presience.
67 il (*a*): *b* ele; ainsi ($P^1C^1C^2D$): *the rest* aussi (*S om.*); comme: *b* (*except* P^2) *om.*
68 prescience: *R* presience; venir ($P^1C^1C^2$): *the rest* avenir; droitement (*a*): *b* droiturierement.
69 presence: *D* prescience A^1A^2 pñce.
70 previdence . . . apelee: *B om.*; previdence (RP^3DM): *the rest* p'vidence; droitement: $P^3A^1A^2M$ droicturierement; pourveance: *B* pourvoiance.
71 establie: *B* estable; tres bassez (*a*): *b* trespassees.
75 necessairez les ch.: *b inverted.*
76 aus: C^1b es; seur eulz: A^2 *om.*; eulz: C^1 els *b* eles.
77 nulle: P^3 aucune; Certez: *b om.*
78 Et (cert.): *b om.*; puet: P^3MDSF^2 peust P^2 poist; present: *b om.*
78-9 divin et du pres.: *B om.*
79 vous veéz: *B* il couvient.
80 voit . . . chosez (*a*): *b* le (A^2 len) voit dieu; en: A^2 a *D* par; eternel *et*: *b om.*

proprieté des chosez, et regarde les chosez presentez envers soy telles comme elles vendront *envers vous* ou temps a venir. Ne elle ne confont pas les jugemens des chosez, ainçois cognoist par un regart de la pensee aussi les chosez qui avendront par neccessité comme celles qui avendront nommie par neccessité. Aussi comme quant vous veéz ensemble un homme aler en terre et le soleil naistre ou ciel, ja soit ce que vous veéz l'un et l'autre ensemble, toutevois les deviséz vous bien et jugiéz que l'un est volontaire et l'autre est neccessaire, aussi donques li divins regars qui voit toutez chosez dessouz soy il ne trouble pas la qualité des (43*rb*) chosez qui sont certainement presentez envers soi, mais, envers la condicion du temps, elles sont a avenir. Dont il s'ensuit que ce n'est pas opinion, ains est miex ferme cognoissance soustenue par verité, quant diex cognoist aucune chose ou a estre *ou a avenir*, la quelle il meismes scet certainement que elle n'a point de neccessité de estre. Et se tu dis ici que ce que diex voit que avendra, il ne puet estre que ce n'aviengne, et ce qui ne puet qu'il n'aviengne, ce avendra par neccessité, et tu me contraingnez a ce non de neccessité, certez je recognoistrai chose de tres ferme verité, mais a ce *entendre* a paine se pourra nulz regardeur aprochier s'il n'est regardeur du divin entendement. Car je te respondrai que cil futurs *ou ce qui est a avenir*, quant il est raportéz a la divine cognoissance, il est neccessairez, mais quant il est entenduz en sa nature, on le voit du tout franc et absolu de toute neccessité. Car deus manieres sont de neccessité: l'une est simple neccessité, si comme il couvient par neccessité que tuit homme soient mortel; l'autre est neccessité condicionnelle, si comme se tu sces que un homme aille, il couvient par neccessité que il aille; car ce que chascuns scet, ce ne puet estre autrement que si comme il le scet, mais ceste condicion ne trait pas avec soy celle simple neccessité. Car ceste neccessité condicionnelle sa propre nature ne la fait pas, ainçois la fait li ajustemens de la condicion; car nulle neccessité ne contraint a aler celui qui va de sa propre volenté, (43*va*) je soit ce que, lors quant il va, il couvient par neccessité qu'il aille. Par celle meismes donques maniere, se la pourveance de dieu voit aucune chose estre presente, il couvient par neccessité que celle chose soit, ja soit ce que elle n'ait nulle neccessité de nature. Mais certez, les futurs qui aviennent par franchise de arbitre, diex les regarde touz ensemble

---

82 la proprieté: *B* la *perspite* *b* *les* proprietes; et (*a*): *b* ains; regarde les ch.: *B* regart de ces ch.
83 vendront: A^2DS avendront; temps: P^1C^2 t. qui est.
84 cognoist: *b* (*except DS*) conjoint *DS* cognoit.
86 quant: P^1C^2 *om.*
87 vous veéz: *R* v. uaies P^1C^1 nous veons C^2 n. voions.
89 est: C^1Rb (*except* P^2F^2) *om.*; aussi: P^3DS ainsi.
90-108 il ne . . . avec soy: *B om.*
90 trouble: C^1 torble *b* (*except* P^3) destourbe P^3 destourne.
91 temps: *b* (*except* P^2A^2) t. ou.
92 miex: P^1 *om.*
94 a (*a*): $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; meismes: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*; scet: C^2 congnost.
95 ici: *R* issi A^2 ainsi; que (avendra) (P^2A^1): C^2 *om.* C^1 il *the rest* qui (q').
96 que ce (aP^2F^2): A^2 que *the rest* qu'il.
96-7 et ce . . . n'aviengne: A^1 *om.*
96 puet (*second*): *b* p. estre; qu'il: P^1C^2MS qui A^2 que C^1 il; n': P^1 *om.*
97 n': P^1 *om.*
97-8 et tu . . . necces.: *D om.*
98 recognoistrai: $P^3A^1A^2M$ cognoistrai.
99 se: *b* (*except* A^2) s'en.
100 respondrai: C^1 respone *D* di; futurs: P^1C^2 *om.*; *ce*: C^1 cel *b* ce (cil) temps.
101 cognoissance: *DS* poissance.
102 en: *b* (*except* P^3A^1M) a; on le voit: P^3 il est.
103 toute: *D* loijens de *S* lijens de; est: P^1 en.
104 comme il: P^1 *om.*; il couvient: C^2 *om.*; par: *DS* de.
105 est neccessité (*aDS*): $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted* F^2 est R^2 neccessite.
106 il couv. . . . aille: *D om.*; ce ne: *DS* il ne A^2 il ne ne P^3 ne.
107 condicion: *S* necessite $P^3A^1A^2M$ condicionelle.
108 condicionnelle: *R* condicionable.
109 la fait: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *om.*
110 neccessité: *B* condicion; de sa: *B* par sa *b* de.
112 Par celle meismes: *b* (*except* A^2) et par celle; pourveance: *R* pourvoiance.
113 aucune: *B* auc. maniere et.
113-4 que celle . . . nature: *B om.*
114 futurs (*a*): *b* choses a avenir.
115-6 touz . . presens: *b* toutes . . presentes.

presens. Se il donques sont raporté au divin regart, il sont fait neccessaire par la condicion de la divine cognoissance; mais s'il sont regardé par eulz, il sont deslié de neccessité et ne delaissent pas la franchise de leur nature. Donques seront sans doubte faitez toutez les chosez que diex scet avant que elles sont a avenir, mais aucunes de elles aviennent *de franche volenté et* de franc arbitre; qui, ja soit ce que elles aviengnent, toutevois en tenant leur estre ne perdent elles pas leur propre nature par la quelle, avant que elles fussent faitez, avoient elles neis eu pooir de nommie avenir."

"Quelle differance donques a il ci *et qu'est ce a dire* que elles ne sont pas neccessairez *par leur propre nature,* comme elles aviengnent en toutez manierez a semblance de neccessité par la condicion de la divine science?" "Ceste differance y est telle que les chosez que je t'ai un pou devant propouseez, c'est li soleil naissans et li homs alans. Que endementiers que ces chosez sont faitez, eles ne peuent eschever que elles ne soient faitez; toutevois l'une, avant que elle fust faite, couvenoit par neccessité que elle fust faite, mais l'autre non pas. (43*vb*) Aussi est il issi que les chosez que diex a presentez sans nulle doubte seront, mais l'une de ceulz descent de la neccessité des chosez, *si comme le soleil naistre,* mais l'autre descent du pooir des feseurs, *si comme homme aler.* Donques deismes nous bien sans faire tort, se ces chosez sont raporteez a la divine cognoissance, elles sont neccessairez; se elles sont regardeez par eulz, elles sont *franchez et* absoluez des lians de neccessité—si comme tout quanque apert a sens, se tu le raportez a raison, il est universel; se tu le raportez a soi meismes, il est singulier. Mais tu diras, se tu veulz: "S'il est assiz en ma puissance de muer mon propons, je aneantiré la pourveance *de dieu* quant je, par aventure, auré mué les chosez que elle cognoist avant." Je te respondrai: "Certez tu pues bien ton propons muer, mais pour ce que la presente verité de la divine pourveance regarde et ce que tu puez ton propons muer et, savoir mon, se tu le mueras et en quelle part tu le tourneras, tu ne pues eschever la divine prescience, aussi comme tu ne pourroies eschever le regart de l'euil present, ja soit ce que tu te convertissez de ta propre volenté en diverses actions." Et tu diras; "Que sera ce donques? Ne sera pas muee la divine science par ma disposicion, si comme quant je voudrai ores une chose et ores une autre, ne nous doit pas estre avis que elle entrechange aussi ses

---

116-8 il (*four times*) . . raporté . . fait . . regardé . . euls . . deslié (P^1 -iee): *b* eles (*four times*) . . raportees . . fetes . . regardees . . eles . . desliees (C^2: raportez . . . faiz . . regardez . . desliez).

119 toutez les chosez: *DS* les ch. toutes P^3 toutes ch.

121 en tenant: P^1 entendant.

123 neis: *BRb* (*except* P^2) *om.* (C^1: avoient elles eu neis pooir); eu: $P^1C^2P^3A^1A^2M$ en; nommie (P^1): C^1C^2R non mie *Bb* non.

124 *et . . . dire*: F^2 *om.* P^2 et que estre a d. *B* que est a d.

126 a semblance (*a except R*; P^2): *D* en semble *the rest* en semblance; neccessité: *R* verite.

127 y: *BRb om.*; devant: P^2 ci d.

128 c'est li soleil (*a*): *b* ce est que li solaus.

129 eles: P^1 el C^1 il.

130-1 toutevois . . . Aussi: *b* de ces deus choses couvenoit certainement la premiere, c'est le souleil naistre ou ciel, par necc. que elle fust faite, mais l'autre non, c'est l'omme aler en terre. Aussi (P^3DS ainsi).

131 issi (*editor's correction*): P^1C^2 ici C^1DS *om. the rest* ci.

132 presentez:. *B* presentees; sans . . . seront: *b* seront s. n. d.; seront: *BR om.*; ceulz: *b* cestes (P^2 ceste A^2 *om*).

134 *homme*: $P^3A^1A^2M$ l'h. *B om.*; deismes nous bien: *B om.*; deismes: *D* desimes *S* desismes *R* deues.

135 faire tort: P^3 injure.

136 eulz: *b* eles.

137 tout . . . apert: P^3 quantque il ap.; le: P^1 les.

138 le: P^1 les.

140 aneantiré: *DS* anientirai *R* aneantere *B* anoientirai C^1 aventure; aventure: *B* anoientirai.

141 mué: *B* nulle; avant: *b* (*except* F^2) *om.* C^1 par av.; respondrai: C^1 respong.

142 pues: *B* pers; bien: *b* (*except* P^2) *om.*

143 que: P^1 *om.*

144 tourneras: $P^3A^1A^2M$ mueras C^1 porras torner.

145 prescience: *B* pourveance presc.

146 te: $C^2BA^2P^2DS$ *om.*; convertissez: P^1 -teissez C^2 -tesisses; diverses: P^3 pluseurs.

148 voudrai (vouldray, vaurai): P^1C^2B voudroie.

149 pas: *B* il ore.

divers fais de cognoistre *si que elle cognoisse une foiz une chose et autre foiz le contraire de ce?" "Non".*

"Certez non, (44*ra*) car li divins regart queurt au devant *et voit* touz futurs, *c'est a dire toutez chosez a avenir,* et les retourne et rapele a la presence de sa propre cognoissance ne il n'entrechange pas, si comme tu cuidez, les fais de cognoistre ore une chose ore une autre, mais il parmanant vient au devant et embrace a un coup toutez tes mutacions. Et ceste presence de toutez chosez comprendre et de veoir les n'a pas prise diex de l'avenement des chosez a avenir, mais de sa propre simplece. Et par ce est solu ce que tu deis un pou ci devant, *c'est assavoir* qu'il n'est pas digne chose de dire que nos futurs doignent cause a la science de dieu *ne que il soient cause de celle prescience.* Car ceste force de science qui toutez chosez embrace par sa presentaire cognoissance establist a toutez chosez propre maniere, et ne doit riens aus chosez derrenierez. Et comme ces chosez soient ainsi, *ce est assavoir que neccessité n'est pas es chosez par la prescience divine,* franchise de arbitre *est et* demeure enterinement es mortiex hommes, ne les lais ne propousent pas *ne ne prometent* felonnessement loiers et paines aus volentéz des hommes qui sont absoluez *et delivrez* de toutez neccessitéz. Et par dessus maint diex, regardeur et cognoisseur de toutez chosez avant neis que elles soient faitez, et la presente pardurableté de sa vision queurt touz jours avec la *diverse* qualité de nos faiz qui sont neis encores a venir, et dispanse *et ordenne* loiers aus bons et tourmens aus mau- (44*rb*) vais. Ne pour niant ne sont pas misez en dieu esperancez et prieres qui ne peuent estre *sans valeur et* sans fait quant elles sont faites droitement.

Despiséz donques *et eschevéz* les vicez *et aiméz et* ensuiéz les vertuz; soulevéz vostre courage a droitez esperancez; tendéz humbles prieres en haut a dieu. Grant neccessité de proece, se vous ne vous en vouléz faindre, vous est *chargiee et* enjointe, *c'est a dire grant mestier vous est que vous soiés prudomme* quant vous faitez toutez vos euvrez devant les yeulz du juge qui toutez chosez voit.

150-1 *une foiz . . autre* f.: $P^3A^1A^2M$ aucune f. . . aucune f.

151 *ce:* *b* cele chose.

152 Certez non: *b* (*except* F^2) *om.*; queurt: *R* si court.

152-3 touz . . . *dire:* P^3 *om.*

155 chose: $P^3A^1A^2M$ ch. et.

156 a un: *B* aucun; tes ($P^1P^3A^2M$): C^1F^2 *om.* BRP^2 les C^2 ses A^1DS ces; mutacions: $P^3A^1A^2M$ muances.

157 veoir les: $P^3A^1A^2M$ *inverted.*

159 *c'est* . . . qu'il: *B om.*

160 a: *b* de.

161 *soient:* *B* aient; Car . . . science: *B om.*

162 presentaire ($P^1C^1C^2$): P^2DS propre *the rest* presente.

164-5 *par la prescience* (C^1): P^1C^2 de la p. *B* par p. *R* par la pourvoiance *b* par la science (A^1M *om.* la).

165 *divine:* A^2 de nostre; arbitre: *followed in* A^2 *by* s'ensuit que le; *est et:* *B* estre; enterinement: P^3 entierement C^1 autrement.

166 lais: P^3 mauvaises lois; propousent: P^1 propousez; *ne ne:* $P^1C^2P^2P^3A^1M$ ne.

166-7 felonnessement: P^3 *om.* *M* felonnement.

167 aus: P^1C^2 es *B* en; absoluez: P^1 absoluz.

168 toutez neccessitéz (*a except* C^1; A^1): *the rest sing.*; neccessitéz: *followed in R by* avant neis que elles soient faites; maint (*a*): *b* est.

169 presente: P^1b presence.

170 pardurableté (*a*): *b* pardurable.

171 sont neis (P^1C^2): BRC^1 est n. *b* est; venir: C^1b (*except* P^3) avenir; dispanse: *B* dispose.

172 misez: P^2DSF^2 mis.

173 esperancez: *b sing.*

175 Despiséz (-siez): P^3 desprisez P^1 despiescez; *et aiméz et* ensuiéz: $P^3A^1A^2M$ hantez et aimez.

176 a ($P^1C^1C^2B$): RP^2DSF^2 aus $P^3A^1A^2M$ es; humbles: P^1 humblement.

177 proece: *B* poete.

178 enjointe (*aDS*): F^2 aioustee P^2A^2 ajointe P^3MA^1 adjoincte.

GTU Library
3 2400 00660 1078

THREE DAY
CIRCULATION

DATE DUE
APR 15 2013
APR 12
DEMCO, INC. 38-2931

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall